

PORT OF MONTREAL

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE

AND OF

THE COMMITTEE

IN RE

THE CHANNEL DEBT.

A
HE554
.M75
A65

MONTREAL :

PRINTED BY THE GAZETTE PRINTING COMPANY.

1888.



Montreal. Board of Trade.

PORT OF MONTREAL.

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE

AND OF

THE COMMITTEE

IN RE

THE CHANNEL DEBT.

MONTREAL :

PRINTED BY THE GAZETTE PRINTING COMPANY.

1888.

9/3

A
HE.554
.M75 A65

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
MEETING of Conference.....	2-32
Remarks by—	
The Chairman.....	4, 16, 24, 25
Mr. Abbott.....	16
" Curran.....	27
" Desjardins.....	29
" Henshaw.....	12
" Hickson.....	13, 24
Capt. Labelle.....	30
Mr. McLennan	7, 11, 31
" Munderloh.....	31
" Alex. Murray.....	11
" W. W. Ogilvie.....	19
" Shanly.....	11, 25, 30
Sir Donald Smith.....	26
Mr. R. A. Smith.....	9, 11, 31
" Reford.....	12
" Van Horne.....	15
Ald. White.....	23
Mr. Watt	21, 32
MEMORIAL from the Committee to Sir Hector Langevin.....	35
General Summary of wharf charges.....	39
Documents sent to Government.....	40
COMMUNICATIONS from—	
Messrs. H. & A. Allan	41, 53
The Canada Shipping Company.....	46
Messrs. Anderson McKenzie & Co.....	50
" David Torrance & Co.....	57
" Munderloh & Co.....	58
" R. Reford & Co.....	60
APPENDIX C.	
Correspondence with the Harbour Board in 1880.....	60
Interview with Government in May 1887.....	62
Wharfage charges—	
In Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia and New York.....	64
In Montreal.....	65
The City Council of Montreal—	
Resolutions by.....	66
The House of Commons—	
Resolutions anent Channel debt.....	67
Sir Charles Tupper's speech.....	68
Note on same.....	73

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FROM THE SHIPPING INTEREST.

At a meeting of the Shipping Interest held in the Council-room of the Board of Trade, on Friday, June 29th, 1888, the Chairman, Mr. Andrew Allan, *inter alia*, reported progress from the Free Port Committee, and laid on the table copies of their various printed papers, after which he moved—

“That the thanks of the Shipping Interest are due, and are hereby tendered, to the Free Port Committee,—and especially to their Chairman, Mr. Geo. A. Drummond, without whose untiring efforts, disinterested labour and great public influence, the measure of relief that Parliament has granted could scarcely have been secured.”

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hugh McLennan and carried unanimously, after which the meeting adjourned.

NOTE.—The line at the top of page 3—“FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION ONLY”—is cancelled.

For Private Circulation only.

PORT OF MONTREAL.

REPORT OF CONFERENCE

HELD IN THE BOARD OF TRADE ROOMS, WEDNESDAY,
JANUARY 18TH, 1888.

A private conference was held this afternoon in the rooms of the Board of Trade. The meeting was attended by merchants, manufacturers and representatives of the shipping trade, and was one of the most influential ever held in the city. The object was to consider the present financial condition of the Harbor of Montreal, the lack of facilities for discharging and loading cargo and the heavy wharfage charges on shipping, imports and exports.

Mr. Geo. A. Drummond, President of the Board of Trade, occupied the chair. His Worship Mayor Abbott, Mr. Andrew Allan, Mr. Joseph Hickson, General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, Mr. Van Horne, Vice-president and General Manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Mr. John Torrance, Agent of Dominion Line, Mr. W. C. Munderloh, German Consul and agent of the White Cross Line, and a very large representation of the mercantile and shipping interests of Montreal testified by their presence to the importance of the meeting, and their anxiety to see its object promoted in a manner satisfactory to the Dominion generally.

The following were among those present:—Sir Donald A. Smith, M.P., John J. Curran, M.P., A. Desjardins, M.P., Capt. Labelle, M.P., Walter Shanly, M.P.; and the following members of Council—W. W. Ogilvie, 1st Vice-President, R. Archer,

C. P. Hebert, Chas. H. Gould, Edgar Judge, R. Paton McLea, J. M. Kirk, Hollis Shcrey; Henry Bulmer, Acting President Harbor Board, Hugh McLennan, Victor Hudon and Andrew Allan, Harbor Commissioners; Joseph Hickson, General Manager G.T.R., W. C. Van Horne, Vice-President C.P.R., F. W. Henshaw, E. K. Greene, R. A. Smith, Alex. Murray, President Canada Shipping Company, Ald. Richard White, M. Nolan Delisle, Austin Cuvillier, J. X. Perrault, John Kerry, D. A. P. Watt, R. Reford, Agent Donaldson Line, Wm. Weir, H. A. Budden and others.

The Chairman read the following telegram from Mr. C. J. Coursol, M.P.:—

ST. THOMAS, P.Q.

On arrival from Quebec yesterday got invitation. Sorry cannot attend. Will use best efforts to assist you; also to obtain from Government promise to abandon interest on capital for dredging river, a work which is of great concern to the Dominion.

The CHAIRMAN said:—Gentlemen, I believe there will be no difference of opinion amongst any intelligent body of citizens as to the fact that we have arrived at a crisis in the history of this port and of the city. I do not desire to have any long speeches if I can help it, and I will not show a bad example myself, but it is necessary that I should define in some degree what the objects of those who called this meeting are.

I assume that none of you are satisfied with the present condition of affairs,—and if there is any one present who is satisfied, he had better declare himself at once—but I take it for the time being that there is no such person here. The Harbor Commission is a body for which, individually, I have a great respect. If I were called upon to select a similar body, I don't know that I could improve upon the constitution of that body. Be that as it may, it is a fact beyond question that the Harbor Commission is utterly powerless under its present circumstances and conditions to effect any serious remodelling of our Harbor or any addition to the accommodation worth notice. The fact is, that the further they go and the deeper they dig into the channel of the river, the deeper they bury themselves under a load of debt from which there is no escape.

I don't blame them, but I certainly say that if we sit down

and pin our trust on the Commission, as at present constituted and under the conditions that now exist, we shall be utterly disappointed and trust to a broken reed.

If it be the case, as has been asserted in my hearing, that the shipping coming to this port cannot bear any further burdens, and that the charges here are greater than are warranted by the accommodation, the question arises for us, where are we to turn and what are we to do to accomplish this desired improvement in our Harbor? I would respectfully suggest that the interests concerned should lay their heads together and decide on immediate action. The Board of Trade has repeatedly, of late years, gone to Ottawa and urged the question on the members of the Government. The answer invariably given to all our applications has been that the Government would give their most serious consideration to the representations made. In fact, the answer to us might have been stereotyped. From time to time we have gone to Ottawa and come back with very much the same flattering assurances, from which nothing whatever has come. I very much fear that it is totally and utterly useless to go on with such deputations in future.

Judging from the fact that a popular government must necessarily look to the different opinions of the entire country before taking any extraordinary measures, I am not disposed to lay too much blame on the Government for their dilatoriness in this matter. But we shall have ourselves to blame if we continue to go to them in the future as we have gone in the past. My opinion is that the time is passed for deputations and complimentary newspaper paragraphs on this subject. I think that an organized agitation, energetic, and resolved to accomplish its object, should take the place of deputations.

The articles in the press and the great system of sending deputations are very well in their way, but they do not go far enough for my fancy. I look round this room and I see prominent business men who are accustomed to deal with their own concerns in a very different spirit from that in which they have heretofore approached this matter. We have now, in my belief, to deal with this question partly as a political and partly as a commercial one.

The Council of the Board of Trade have not prepared any programme for to-day's proceedings. They have ideas no

doubt, but I think it would be presumption for myself or for the Council of the Board to convene a meeting such as I see to-day and to come here prepared with cut and dry resolutions, which would be assented to probably as a matter of course, and not giving anyone any particular trouble, would become a dead-letter sooner or later. If you, gentlemen, desire to pursue a successful agitation which I hope to see now commenced, you are bound to give this question full and earnest consideration, to express your opinions frankly and freely, and to put your shoulders to the wheel, and work for yourselves without trusting to anybody. We don't want engineering plans. I think it would be utterly out of place now to discuss any particular plan for the extension of the Harbor or the improvement of the Channel. We have not yet reached that point, and are contending first for the general principle. As far as I take it, the Harbor Commission is in a state of practical bankruptcy; it has really resolved itself into a Government Department for the collection of dues and the payment of interest on the money spent. What are we to do under the circumstances. The question is one which is of interest to all classes of citizens. The general property-holder of the city of Montreal has as deep an interest in this question as the mercantile community and the shipping interest. It is for the benefit of every man in the city who is depending on industry for his bread and butter to have the matter settled once for all. I look upon it that the general property-holder represented by the Corporation is as much interested in the question as any other class of the community. But above all it is the question which affects most closely the producer of exportable products throughout the whole Dominion: for any remission of dues, any reduction of the charges inseparable from the carrying of his property to a market, is so much money in his pocket. (Applause.)

During the past year, the two great railways, centering in this city, have been enormously developed; new roads have been opened, and new trade promoted, which will give occupation to shipping and benefit the country immensely. To meet this development, nothing has been done. The Harbor of Montreal has not, in any sense, been improved worthy of the developments which are going on around us, and which will demand further accommodation, if we are to avail ourselves of this trade. I

would like to hear from Mr. McLennan, if he has anything to say in defence of the Harbor Commission, which he represents here, and if he can give us any hope that the Board is in a position to make improvements in the direction I have indicated. There are also present, to-day, representatives of the shipping interest, and I would like to learn from them if the shipping can bear any further burdens. It appears to me that there are two projects open to us. One is to go to the Government, to urge upon them that the deepening of the Channel and the maintenance of the Harbor is a work in which the Dominion is more interested than we, and to ask them to take it up as a public work, and make this a free port. This is a broad and sweeping step, no doubt. The other is to assume that, if the Government relieve us from the burden of the Channel debt, which it is no more the business of Montreal to bear than the Canals from here to Kingston, we will then take charge of the Harbor and its wharves ourselves. It will be for you to express an opinion on these points, and on your decision to-day will no doubt largely depend the future of this question. I ask Mr. McLennan, if I have misconstrued the position of the Harbor Board, to let us know in a few words in what respect I have erred.

Mr. HUGH McLENNAN, Board of Trade representative on the Harbor Board, said:—Gentlemen,—I must go back some years to explain the position of the Harbor Commission. In 1873, when the Commissioners were paying the interest on the Harbor debt, amounting to about \$80,000, in view of the steadily increasing business of the port, and of the fact that the 20-foot Channel which had been secured was not sufficient for the enlarged description of steamers that were then being constructed, the Harbor Commissioners secured legislation authorizing the expenditure of a million and a half (\$1,500,000) upon the river improvement, for which they were to pay five per cent. interest. At the same time they secured authority to borrow \$1,250,000 for the enlargement of the Harbor. They went on with these works until 1880, when it became apparent to the Commissioners that the resources arising from the revenues of the Harbor would not be sufficient for the carrying out of both the Harbor and the Channel work that had been undertaken, and which they were then prosecut-

ing. They then urged that the Government should assume the burden of the Channel debt. They were encouraged, time and again, by the Government of the day, and informed that the question would receive consideration. At that time river improvement seemed to be most essential. In 1882, the work upon the Harbor practically ceased. It was found by the Commissioners that they could no longer carry on the two branches of the work on which they were engaged, and be able to pay the current interest upon the indebtedness that had been authorized. The river work has been prosecuted up to the present time, but without the relief that was necessary to enable the Commissioners to carry forward any work for the improvement of the Harbor. I shall now give you an idea of the revenues expended by the Commissioners.

The revenue for the past year, and it has been a very good year, and will compare favorably with the best of years in the experience of the Harbor Commissioners. The entire revenue last year was \$289,000. The disbursements were \$116,000, interest upon the Harbor debt proper; \$100,000, paid to the Government for interest upon the debt of the river improvement; about \$35,000, expenditure for executive and general expenses, inclusive of the engineer's department; about \$50,000, for repairs to the Harbor; and \$13,000 for the buoys and beacons: making a total expenditure which is in excess of the revenue this year. It is, therefore, apparent to all how helpless the Harbor Board is to carry on any additional work.

The Government assumed that they were granting relief time and again, but their relief was of such a character that it really did not meet the exigencies of the situation. The grant, for instance, of \$325,000 last year, for the completion of the Channel, will be paid back in interest by the time the work is finished, if the Government insists on its present policy.

It is equally apparent, from the figures I have given, that if the Government will assume the river indebtedness and relieve the revenues of the Harbor, it will place about one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) at the disposal of the Harbor Commissioners, by which they could carry forward the work of Harbor enlargement. As the Chairman has stated, there has been no practical enlargement of the Harbor since the time of the initiation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which will

from present crop, give us several millions of grain, as a forecast of the future development of the country, and which will be far in excess of anything that this Harbor has been called upon to handle hitherto. We have now the Sault Ste. Marie road, opening up to us the Western States and the largest milling interests in the world. If we are prepared to receive this business, we can have it in Montreal.

The Harbor Commissioners have not neglected their duty during the period I speak of. It was futile to consider any plans for the improvement of the Harbor, while there was no possibility of carrying on the work. I may state, however, that in the hope that the present agitation may lead to better results, and that the Government may see the necessity of adopting the right course towards the policy of the country with reference to river expenditure, that the Harbor Commissioners have now under consideration and will be prepared with a plan for the enlargement of the Harbor. That work is now in process by their engineer, and will be completed as early as the Harbor Commissioners can deal with this important question. So far as the influence of the Harbor Commissioners could go, they have been unceasing in their efforts to make such representations to the Government as would lead them to give relief by removing the necessity for paying this \$100,000 interest annually and making it a charge upon the revenues of the Dominion. As a Harbor Commissioner, I believe that if we were relieved of this burden, we might be able to construct such works, by a reasonable expenditure, as would be commensurate with the growing demands on our Harbor accommodation. This question cannot be postponed indefinitely without injury to the trade of the port. If the Harbor had only the burden of maintaining itself, the Commissioners could do something, but when its revenues are diverted outside, the Commissioners are powerless to carry out their trust in a manner worthy of the growing importance of our city.

The CHAIRMAN :—That bears out what I stated. I should like to hear from the shipping interest. What do you say, Mr. Smith?

Mr. R. A. SMITH, representing the Allan Line, said:—I entirely agree with the views which have been expressed as to the

desirability of increasing our Harbor accommodation and the necessity of being relieved from the Channel debt. But in my estimation it is essential that our first and greatest efforts should be directed towards relieving shipping and traffic from the taxes which they now bear at this port. During the past season, that share of Harbor revenue which is derived from the tax on ships and shipping—ocean-going vessels and their cargoes—amounted to about \$240,000. This tax is one which has proved extremely burdensome to ship owners. In so far as I am concerned, I would much prefer that any measures looking towards the improvement of the Harbor and the extension of its accommodation, should be contingent upon ships and shipping being first relieved from taxes in their entirety. In other words, that the port of Montreal should be made a free port. As to the manner whereby the revenue necessary for the purpose of meeting the expenditure required for Harbor improvement purposes can be obtained, that, I think, should be matter for subsequent determination. But I believe that the prosperity of our port requires that our first and greatest exertions should be directed towards securing relief to our shipping from the burdensome taxes which it has heretofore borne and which at present attaches to it.

The CHAIRMAN:—Can you add to that a statement of how we stand, so far as regards charges on shipping, with rival ports such as Boston, New York and Portland?

Mr. R. A. SMITH:—I may state, in a general way, that taxation at the port of Montreal largely exceeds that of any other port on this continent. I may also say that about one-fifth of the tonnage of this port last season was represented by vessels of the Allan Line. It is safe to assume that of the revenue of \$240,000 obtained by the Harbor Commissioners from the taxation on ocean shipping during the same period, about \$50,000 or \$60,000 was derived from those vessels and their cargoes; while at all other ports frequented by the steamers of the Allan Line—Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, Boston and Portland—they are practically free from such taxation. It can, therefore, be readily understood, that with our climatic disadvantages and short season, with the rates of insurance against us in the spring and fall months, and handicapped as we are by these port charges, it is hopeless to expect either to attract shipping in increasing

volume to the St. Lawrence, or that our existing lines can compete successfully with their rivals from American ports, until the removal of the burden of our port charges has been secured.

Mr. HUGH McLENNAN :—But the leading Harbors in the United States are largely aided by the Government, sometimes the entire expenditure is by the Government, and their ports are, so to speak, free ports, the only charge being for the use of the wharves, which are private property.

Mr. WALTER SHANLY :—So are the harbours of Canada all constructed at the cost of the Government, always excepting the Port of Montreal.

Mr. SMITH :—It is immaterial as to the means by which this accommodation is furnished so long as the steamers frequenting such ports have freedom from taxation. It is essential, it is in fact of paramount importance, that our own first steps should be in the direction of securing freedom of tonnage from taxes, in short, of making Montreal, as far as may be practicable, a free port.

The CHAIRMAN :—I should be pleased if any other representative of the shipping interest would speak to the question now.

Mr. ALEXANDER MURRAY, President of the Canada Shipping Company, said :—It may be an extraordinary statement to you and to the meeting, Mr. Chairman, but really it is nothing new, that Montreal is the most expensive port on the Continent to bring a ship to. Some years ago, when I was foolish enough to join one of those futile deputations to Ottawa on this question, I showed a statement that we could disburse in New York the same steamer for \$800 less than in Montreal. That excited Mr. Robertson's indignation, but I gave him the figures in black and white, so that he could take no exception to them afterwards. That was perfectly well known then and is now, and I do not think it necessary to take any further evidence from shipping men as to a fact which has been known for years.

We have been begging on our knees for years before the Government, and the question now is, what steps shall we take in the interest of Montreal and of the country at large, to have justice done. I believe the present Government is no better or no worse than other Governments in Canada. All of them are more interested in keeping themselves in power, than in

caring for the interests of the country at large. I believe as long as you are on your knees to them, it will do very little good. Take a good stick in your hand, and hold it above their head, and you will be more successful.

I do not think that the members for Montreal, and from the districts surrounding Montreal, have in the past done their duty in this matter. The fact is the Government can rely upon them too much. The members from Quebec and its vicinity understand these matters better than we do, and, although they are nearly all in opposition to-day, I believe they can get more from the Government than our members who sit on the Government side of the house. I would suggest the establishment of a "lobby" in Ottawa next session, and the making of a "combine" of all the members, around Montreal and between this and Kingston, interested in the trade of Montreal. Let them organize and have a good understanding amongst themselves, and if possible secure "Room No. 8" to hold their meetings in.

Mr. ROBT. REFORD, Agent for several lines, said:—I have much pleasure in corroborating all that has been said by Mr. Smith and Mr. Murray. One point that has not been touched upon, and which should be calculated among the taxes we have to pay in Montreal, is the cost of erecting and taking down our sheds. It costs the lines which I represent \$3,000 to take down our sheds for the winter and put them up again in the spring. In addition to this expense, last year, during the month of May, the wharves were covered with water nearly three feet deep. The entire expense of elevating the cargo on platforms had to be borne by the ships, and our expenses on that occasion represented \$2,000. In no other port on earth where taxes are paid would such a condition of things be allowed. The Harbor Commissioners did not refund the cost, and we had to bear it. I agree with Mr. Murray, that we have got to take strong steps at Ottawa before we can hope for redress, and such action should be taken at once.

Mr. F. W. HENSHAW, ex-President of the Board of Trade, said:—I think the discussion has drifted away from the main subject which is before the meeting. If I understand the invitation I received to attend this meeting, it was to devise some means, if possible, of increasing the Harbor accommodation of Montreal.

You said, Mr. Chairman, in your opening address, that for years we had hopelessly appealed to the Government at Ottawa to relieve the Harbor from the Lake St. Peter debt. I can say that, during my term of office, during the whole time I have had the honor to sit on the Council of the Board of Trade—nearly seventeen years now,—most of that time we have been engaged in the same operations and with no better results than we see to-day. Although deputation after deputation of the first men in Montreal has laid these questions before the Government, they have politely said that it should be taken under their most serious consideration, and from that day to this nothing has been done. The question was started a few years ago of making Montreal a free port. That idea was received with the joyous shouts of the whole community. Everyone went in for having a free port. The question about taxation on our vessels was brought up and laid before the public as powerfully as Mr. Smith has done to-day. The result was that we got a small measure of relief by taking off some wharfage dues on wheat and flour, which, however, benefited the shipper more than the shipping. The reason why some relief could not be extended to the shipping was on account of this heavy channel debt. Let the Government relieve us of that incubus and we can assure the ship-owners of Montreal that their taxes will be lessened by that amount. It is a favorite theme of pride in Montreal that we have never asked anything for our Harbor. We boasted of that, and very properly so too. But if you are going to ask aid to extend your Harbor, you have to drop, for the present, this boast. But the city of Montreal, in her own interest, ought, in case of need, to stand behind bonds for the proper construction of the Harbor. We shall get no measure of relief from the Government by resting on our oars. If we lie here supinely on our backs and wait for the Government to take action, we shall see the trade which ought to come to Montreal going to the south of us.

The CHAIRMAN:—Does any other gentleman wish to speak on this question. I differ from Mr. Henshaw, as I think the discussion is going on in the lines on which it started. I should like to have the benefit of the experience and wisdom of the gentlemen representing the railway corporations. Let them favor us.

Mr. JOSEPH HICKSON, General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, said:—I was very much pleased to hear the statement

made by Mr. Smith. It only corroborated facts within my own knowledge, and what I have been aware of for a considerable time. The expenses of this port are very onerous, and a very serious drawback to the business passing through it. How it is to be remedied is a question upon which I daresay there will be a great diversity of opinion. Personally, I think that the whole work ought to be undertaken by the Government. Here we have a fine canal system connecting the Harbor of Montreal with the river, which is really a part of the canal, and why should not the Government extend the canal system right to Quebec? If that were done, you would have the responsibility, combined with the power, to apply a remedy. I do not think you have the power under the present organization, and that is the trouble. The Harbor Commissioners, everybody will admit, are as influential and efficient a body of business men as you will find in this community, but they are really powerless to carry out the work necessary in order to develop the port, and I fear very much that if the control of the Harbor were transferred to the city there would not be a very marked improvement. I, for one, do not think that the Municipal Government is calculated to undertake and to carry out efficiently the management of a work like the Harbor of Montreal. I do not think that our experience of the city government should give us confidence that they could do it efficiently.

Then what is the other resource—another Commission with extended powers, or the intervention of the Government? It seems to me that the intervention of the Government would be the most efficient way of obtaining redress, and I also think—looking on what they have done elsewhere, the large amount of money that is being spent in improving the Harbors of other ports—that Montreal is justified in asking the Government to undertake those great works and the management of this harbour, and to free the city from the debt or liabilities, which if it undertook the management, it would be obliged to incur.

I really fail to see in all the discussions which have taken place about the matter, that there is any solid reason why the citizens of Montreal should tax themselves to maintain the Harbor and to maintain these works. They are really for the benefit of the whole country; for the commerce of the entire Dominion, more or less, during one season in the year passes

through this port. Why Montreal should be made an exception as compared with other more favoured places, I have never been able to give myself a sufficient explanation. I believe that if the work were attached to a government department the necessary enlargement of the Harbor would be obtained, and it would also be efficiently administered. I see no other remedy for the present state of things. The Harbor accommodation is universally admitted to be insufficient for our wants and not calculated to develop the trade of the country.

Mr. W. C. VAN HORNE, Vice-President and General Manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, said:—I have not any particular plan to suggest, but I imagine that everyone present is agreed in the opinion that some immediate steps are necessary for the enlargement of the Harbor facilities of Montreal. As to whether this can best be done by the Harbor Commissioners, or the City Government or the Dominion Government, I don't feel competent to express an opinion. Quite a number of plans have been suggested, and I have no doubt that the engineers of the Harbor Board will be able to propose a scheme for Harbor improvement that will be sufficient for the purpose. Any one of the three or four, or half-dozen schemes which have been suggested, would be infinitely better than the present state of affairs. I suppose the chief difficulty will be found in providing the necessary money for carrying out the works that may be decided upon. It seems to me that the Dominion Government ought at least to assume the Lake St. Peter debt. How long it is going to take to induce the Government to do that, in order to place the Harbor Board in a position to carry out the work here, it is hard to say. There may be a delay of one, two, three, or even four years, which would be a great loss to the trade of the country generally.

Some people, I know, in Western Ontario and elsewhere, are short-sighted enough to think that the City of Montreal ought to provide the necessary funds, not recognizing the fact that the deepening of Lake St. Peter is a work for the benefit of the whole Dominion, at least of all the Dominion west of Quebec. I think it extremely important not alone to improve and extend the Harbor, but also to wipe out as far as possible all of the present port charges and make the port a free port if possible. (Applause). The wisdom of such a course has been made apparent by the

wonderful development of trade at Antwerp, following the making a free port of Antwerp and the provision of ample facilities for shipping.

Mr. REFord :—Was that a Government work ?

Mr. VAN HORNE :—Yes, the work was done by the Government and the port has no taxes or charges of any kind. That port has developed wonderfully since the completion of the work and the removal of the charges. Ocean carriers go there with freights for places twice as far inland as from Hamburg and other ports, because they avoid these charges and are able to discharge their cargoes and get away in half the time required at other ports. There are a number of gentlemen present who are infinitely more competent to express an opinion as to just how these things should be done than I am. I wish to record my opinion that the work should be done in such a way as to admit of Montreal being made a free port; and that it should be a free port is, I think, to the interest of every portion of the Dominion.

The CHAIRMAN :—We have had some very important expressions of opinion, and I think it all points in one direction, that is toward the hint thrown out by Mr. Murray that we should organize a powerful committee and give it powers to the fullest extent to endeavour to carry out our object. That is the keynote of the situation. If we continue sending deputations from Montreal to Ottawa we shall see the same results as in the past. I should like to know from the city authorities whether they fully apprehend what has been put before them—that this matter affects not alone the merchant, shipper and railway man, but that it is one in which every householder and citizen of Montreal is directly concerned. But there is the broader view of the situation, which was touched upon by Mr. Hickson and Mr. Van Horne, viz., that the Port of Montreal is the port of the province of Ontario and all the Dominion west of Quebec. If the western provinces had only a village at this point, instead of a large city like Montreal, they would soon find it to their advantage to develop and improve the port at their own expense. I should like to hear an expression of opinion from our worthy Mayor.

Hon. J. J. C. ABBOTT, Mayor of Montreal, said :—Gentlemen, I am afraid with regard to the civic authorities I should feel bound to agree with Mr. Hickson, and I am sure that other members of the Corporation, who have experience of the city, will

coincide in these views, that the management, extension and improvement of the Harbor are not matters that fall properly within the jurisdiction of a municipal body. The men who compose a municipal body are not generally supposed to be trained in the knowledge which is necessary for such a subject as that. They have the important interests of a particular class to attend to which have hitherto proved quite sufficient for their powers, and I think it would be a misfortune to see the maritime affairs—if I may so call them—of a port like this, destined to become a great outlet for trade, fall into the hands of a local municipal authority. Especially so, as in reality this is a national port. It is the national port of the Dominion of Canada, and ought not be placed, in my opinion, under the management or control of a local body. (Hear, hear.)

So far as that goes, and so far as contribution by the city goes, towards the enlargement of the Harbor, I don't think any movement could be made by the meeting that would be beneficial to that object. There are many objects for which money is required by the city, and which the revenues of the city at present are insufficient to promote effectively, and to impose upon the city burdens beyond those essential to the comfort of the citizens is not, it would seem to me, a businesslike or prudent move. It would be well to consider before making such a move, what practical object we have a chance of gaining at this moment. As to our becoming a free port in the future, most of us may live to see it, but I do not think that at present we are in a position to seriously press it. We have upon us a burden which by universal consent is pronounced to be an unjust one, the burden of the Lake St. Peter debt. When I come to this subject I feel myself embarrassed by the fact that I am one of the body whom Mr. Murray proposes to follow up with a sharp stick. (Applause.) I don't wish to say more than is necessary. I have a strong opinion that the burden of the Lake St. Peter debt ought not be placed on the Harbor of Montreal, and that is the unanimous opinion of the people of Montreal and vicinity. If we look, on the other hand, to another section of the people, we find, perhaps, a good many strong opinions in an opposite direction. It is attributable to that fact, and not to any unreasonable supineness of the Government, that the burden of the river debt has not been long ago removed from the Harbor of Montreal.

Gentlemen who live here in Montreal, knowing very well the current of opinion about them, should look with a little indulgence upon gentlemen who have to consider not only the public opinion of Montreal, but of a vast territory 3000 miles across. That is precisely the position of the Government. I have no right to speak for the Government. I am not authorized or prepared to do so, but I think I may state, as a matter of fact, that I know the opinions of many members of the Government to be just as I have stated my opinions to be—that this burden of the Lake St. Peter debt is not one which should rest upon the Harbor of Montreal. I have no doubt that steps will be taken before long to remove this burden from the Harbor. I do not think the Harbor Commissioners are to be blamed for spending money on deepening Lake St. Peter; but on the contrary they should be applauded for having carried on a work which has helped largely to make Montreal what it is, and I do not believe that any one in Montreal thinks differently. And, on the other hand, I don't think they ought to be censured for not, under present circumstances, expending money on the enlargement of the Harbor, for the simple reason that they have neither the money nor the means to get it. It is not that they are disinclined to make progress, but that the resources they derive from the port of Montreal must pay the interest on the debt incurred to bring trade to Canada. A part of that debt should be taken off their shoulders, and it will leave them a large margin of revenue; a portion of which may be usefully expended on the payment of interest on the capital required to enlarge and improve the Harbor. That, I understand, the Harbor Commissioners are perfectly willing to do. I have been a Harbor Commissioner for a short period, and I know that the Commissioners are looking towards measures to enable them to raise money to improve the Harbor in proportion to the increasing demands upon it. At this moment their position is identical with the majority of citizens. They are imploring the Government to take off this port the burden of the Lake St. Peter debt, and they intend, with the means this will place at their disposal, to carry on those improvements and enlargements of the harbor which they are just as anxious about as any citizen in Montreal. That is, I think, the position of the Harbor Commissioners and the position

which Mr. McLennan stated. This is about all I have to say and I trust I have not trespassed too long on your patience. (Cries of "No" and "Go on.")

It is practical, it seems to me now, perhaps by modified action similar to that which Mr. Murray suggests, to get this river debt taken off the harbor of Montreal. That will give us the means to improve the Harbor and give to the Harbor Commissioners the power of raising money for the enlargement of the Harbor. All that is practical, and it is in the near future, in my opinion, and might probably be carried out during next session of Parliament, if there were a concerted effort made by all those interested in this port, and the maritime affairs of the Dominion, to have such an object attained. Might I suggest to you, and to the Committee you propose to appoint, to press for a practical object—the assumption of the Lake St. Peter debt by the Government. But I think the attempt to make Montreal a free port at the present time would be a fruitless one. Probably in pressing for more than we can get, we may not obtain that which I think we really can get, and which would be an important step towards the result we all wish for. (Applause.)

Mr. W. W. OGILVIE said:—One point has been lost sight of, and that is that the majority of the Harbor Commissioners are appointed by the Government. The Government have maintained such a close supervision over the affairs of the Board, that during the time of the negotiations for making a land survey, the then Minister of Public Works came down to the meeting, took a seat, and nominated one of the engineers. I may say that at that time, the members of the Harbor Commission were not in favor of this. At that time, and during the whole term of its existence, the Harbor Commission has been under the control of the Government. The deepening of Lake St. Peter was first started, and the money first spent by the Government. The then Harbor Commissioners endorsed the bonds, assumed the work for the Government, and have virtually been running it for the Government ever since. We speak of the Harbor Commissioners, and a stranger here might go away with the idea that they were an independent board elected in Montreal, and not that a majority of them were named and nominated by the Government in Ottawa, with the Government controlling the expenditure of the money.

I should not like to have a partner having the sole control of the expenditure of the establishment, who could make me assume the whole liability and entire cost, yet that is exactly the position the Harbor Commissioners are in with respect to the Government.

I think we are now going in a right direction, and that we are nearer to the assumption of the debt by the Government than ever we were before. We had their assurance last session, and I feel they will carry out their promises. It has been stated that, with the exception perhaps of Quebec, Montreal stands alone in this matter, and that all other ports in the Dominion were built by the Government. I am interested in Goderich, where we have a mill, and if I want some improvement there, I don't go to any Harbor Commissioner, or to the town of Goderich, or to anyone else. I go to Ottawa. The Government has already spent \$500,000 there. Why is it that Montreal should be so differently treated as compared with other ports? Last year, when we went to Ottawa, the case was so ably put before the Minister by our worthy Mayor, that we were led to understand something would be done during the Session, and there never was a more favorable opportunity of doing it. The Minister of Public Works could not be blind as to the position he stood in with regard to Quebec. Quebec then owed the Government \$133,000 of interest, and had only \$30,000 to pay it. Sir Hector must have known this, yet another \$1,200,000 was advanced, making a total interest-charge of over \$200,000, with only the \$30,000 to meet it. Although Quebec is quite welcome to all she can get, and the rest of the Dominion the same, I don't see why Montreal is treated so badly by the Government. Perhaps they look upon the other as the prodigal son, and give him the fatted calf, whereas we, like the good boys, get nothing. I have been asked in Ottawa, "Why don't you do like Quebec, go back and don't pay your interest?" but I am happy to say that Montreal has paid its debt and acted honorably. I am glad we have such a representative meeting here, and that we have the representatives of the two great railways, who are a little stronger than the rest of the Dominion outside. (Laughter.) If we can get them to act with us, there is nothing to prevent Sir Hector Langevin bringing the matter before the House this year, and relieving us of our burdens. (Applause.)

Mr. D. A. WATT said:—It would be no more than reasonable that this meeting should coincide with Mr. McLennan in deprecating any undue criticism on the part of the public towards the Harbor Board. The Commissioners are simply the administrators of a public trust, taking in and paying out so much money, and thereby arranging to extend and maintain the Harbor as their means will permit. If they are expected to go on enlarging their works, it is for the public in general to put them in a position to do so, and I think the Commissioners deserve the thanks of the community in that they have not weighted the Harbor with a load of debt. Our Harbor works presently represent three millions of expenditure (\$3,000,000), as against only two millions (\$2,000,000) of debt. It has been said that a majority of the Commissioners are appointed by Government; that they are in truth a branch of the Government, and in fact good Conservative office-holders. I think the time may come when these gentlemen may have to say to the Government in Ottawa: "If you don't do justice to Montreal, we won't serve you any more and we will resign." I doubt whether there is a self-respecting Conservative merchant in Montreal who, under these circumstances, would accept office under a Government which should continue to leave Montreal in the lurch as she has hitherto been. Mr. Abbott seems to think that all we can get is relief from the Lake St. Peter debt. I think we ought to get more. We have already paid upwards of \$800,000 of interest, and before the work is finished we shall have paid \$1,000,000. That is to say, the Government has exacted from the port of Montreal interest during construction and while the works were only in progress. This refund would give a million dollars for improvements, but what can one do with a million dollars on a Harbor like Montreal? You will find it go a very short way indeed in that direction. One thing has become certain, namely, that interest cannot continue to be paid by taxation on shipping, because taxation will drive away trade. Whatever is done for the Harbor, nothing should be done to add to the existing burdens on traffic; but, on the contrary, the existing burdens should be largely lessened or removed. How, then, are they to be lessened? Some people think the Government should lessen them, while others think that all the Government can do is to take from us the burden of the Lake St. Peter debt. Millions of

dollars had been spent on navigable waters and harbors all over the Dominion, and the Government does not exact interest from the works. The Goderich Harbor is not taxed by the Ottawa people. Quebec has been given five million dollars, and the bills were supported by the Government and passed by Parliament, while they knew the position of the Quebec Harbor to be, about \$50,000 income and \$20,000 expenses, leaving but \$30,000 net profits to pay interest on \$5,000,000. Notwithstanding this state of affairs, the bills were passed by Parliament with scarcely a question from either side of the House. Yet we are very carefully told that Montreal need not ask anything. All the favor is to be shown to ports that have comparatively no business, and even-handed justice withheld from a port that does the largest business in the Dominion.

The port of Montreal should be encouraged and aided by the city as well as by the country generally. I don't think we need look for much from the Quebec Government, as I daresay constitutional objections would apply there, but any objection to the city of Montreal undertaking some of this work is untenable. So far as my experience goes, I think that the majority of the Harbors in the United Kingdom are to a considerable extent civic Harbors. In view of the benefit which our Harbor confers on the city, and of the increased value which it brings to property as well as to business, I think that the city should give liberal assistance to the work. We should remember that Montreal gave one million dollars to the North Shore Railway, and three quarters of a million, if I remember aright, to the Grand Trunk, and the improvement of the Harbor is a work of greater civic importance than either. In event of the City Council voting to the Harbor a similar sum, it would not be necessary that they should manage it. They did not seek to manage the North Shore or the Grand Trunk. One of the best investments the city of Montreal could make would be the grant of a sufficient sum to let it go forth to the world that Montreal was a free port.

I do not think we should run away with the idea that nothing more is required than getting rid of this Lake St. Peter debt. Mr. Murray furnished a statement which I read in Ottawa, and which was afterwards published, regarding port charges. One of his ships went in and out of Montreal and, in respect to these charges, the expense was about \$1200, while the same ship

went in and out of New York, and the expense was but \$400. One of the items in Montreal was \$269 for pilotage. The Government is so interested in this hardy class of mariners below Quebec, that it secures to them a minimum salary. These pilots are legally organized into a kind of a commune, so that they, each and all, do draw an uniform and minimum salary for life, whether the business warrants it or not. Public services such as theirs should be a pension-charge on the public revenue, and not tax on shipping. In New York the pilotage fees would have been only \$184. The charge for wharfages in Montreal on the cargo inwards and outwards, and on the ship, was \$800; in New York the charge was but \$40 a day on one occasion, and on another \$50. The main thing, above all others, in the interests of the whole Dominion, is to get those excessive charges reduced, or better still abolished.

The Government should undoubtedly help in the work of Harbor enlargement; the city should also help; but there is no reason why the railways should not also aid in the work. In Portland the Grand Trunk Railway Company has spent large sums in building wharves. In Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, the great railways have spent millions of dollars on wharf accommodations, which they freely offer to ocean vessels free of charge. Here, the railway companies have found a wharf prepared for them, and have been admitted to its use. If any large scheme of improvement is undertaken, and if the railway companies are to be facilitated and accommodated, they, too, by a yearly subvention or otherwise, should contribute half a million each.

The CHAIRMAN asked Alderman White if he could give the meeting any information as to the position the city stood in, with regard to this project.

Ald. RICHARD WHITE said:—Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I think our first object ought to be to induce the Government to assume the Lake St. Peter debt and we may afterwards consider some plan by which the charges can be reduced in the Harbor. As to how far the city would go in the matter, or how far the railways would go, or how far the Government would go, I can not say. I do not think it would be possible to make anything like a positive assertion as to what action the city would take, as

the matter has never been discussed by the Council. There are, however, some expenses in connection with the wharves borne now by the Harbor Commissioners which the city might assume, the police and care of the revetment wall, for instance. Probably in a re-arrangement there are duties of this kind which the city could and would assume. I quite agree with the Mayor that at the moment our efforts should be directed to have this Lake St. Peter debt removed as a charge on the port. That is the most practical thing we can do, and it will give us plenty of work to accomplish it during the next two months. From what I know of public opinion, both here and in Ottawa, on the question, I am sanguine that if we keep at this object we shall achieve it. If we succeed, we have as a certainty \$100,000 a year more than we had before, to be expended on the Harbor, and that will be one point gained. The question as to how far this will be supplemented by the city or by railroads and other bodies interested will then be more intelligently discussed than it can be to-day. The discussion has led us to see that we must vigorously press on the Government their duty in this matter, and that we should enlist the active assistance and sympathy of all favorably disposed towards our object. One noticeable want in the past has been that the merchants of Montreal have not sufficiently appreciated the value of the influence of members from surrounding constituencies. If the Board of Trade took a little more pains to make themselves and their wants known to neighbouring members it would be better for them and the city's interests. In the meantime, if we get the Lake St. Peter debt removed, I think that other advantages will follow to the Harbor, and follow very rapidly.

The CHAIRMAN said:—Undoubtedly the most practical step to be taken at present is to appoint a strong Committee, with ample powers, to carry on a vigorous agitation.

Mr. HICKSON:—I should like to know for what the Committee is to agitate.

The CHAIRMAN:—It would be impossible to define very closely the functions of the Committee, but, as I stated, they should be charged with very full powers, and authorized for as much as they can obtain, in justice to the port of Montreal and the development of the trade of the Dominion. But I would not lay down a hard and fast line. If they cannot get the Government to assume the

debt and make the Harbor of Montreal a free port at one sweep, I should say they ought take as much as they can get, on the principle that a half loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. HICKSON said that it might be a long time before they would have such a representative meeting again. He gathered from the addresses that the great majority of those present were in favor of making Montreal a free port. For that reason he wished to have an expression of the meeting as to the functions of the Committee.

Mr. WALTER SHANLY, M.P., said:—If I understand this thing right, for what object is it? There is very considerable probability that we will be relieved of the river debt, and if I understand the discussion here to-day, the money represented by the interest on that debt may be spent upon the Harbor, so that, as far as I can see, there would be no relief for shipping. My belief is that unless you make this a free port there is very little use enlarging the Harbor and spending money on it. Last session, when Sir Charles Tupper brought down his loan resolutions, I had occasion to say that I did not see what good the enlargement of the canals would be, so long as you enlarged them only to bring down freight to a port to which it would not come. I believe now, as I told the House of Commons then, that the Government will never gain the fruition from the immense expenditure on the canals above, until the Harbor of Montreal below is practically made a free port. Do I understand the intention is, if the Government assume this burden, to expend a similar sum on the Harbor, and still maintain the tax on shipping?

The CHAIRMAN:—I can hardly categorically reply to that enquiry. The Committee will be guided by the expression of opinion here to-day, and the Resolution I have to propose is to look after making Montreal a free port. It will be for the Committee to find out the best way of doing that. I will now read the Resolution.

Resolved—That the following gentlemen be a Committee to organize at once a vigorous effort in favor of making Montreal a free port, and extending and improving the harbor:—

City:—The Mayor of the city and the Chairman of the Finance Committee.

Railways:—The General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Vice-President of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Board of Trade:—The President of the Board of Trade; one member of

the Board of Trade representing the export trade, and one member of the Board of Trade representing the import trade.

Shipping:—Two representatives of the shipping interests.

The President of Le Chambre du Commerce, Montreal.

I desire further to say that more than once last year the Board of Trade found it necessary to return thanks to the local members, Sir Donald Smith, Mr. Curran, and Mr. Coursol. We never went to Ottawa without having the services and assistance of the local members readily and heartily given to us. I will add that it will be the first duty of this committee to enlist the sympathy of all the members, especially to the westward of Montreal, in this question. In the meantime, I would wish Sir Donald Smith, Mr. Curran, Mr. Desjardins, and Capt. Labelle, members whom I see present, to say a few words on this question.

SIR DONALD A. SMITH:—I should have preferred to have spoken after Mr. Curran, but the expressions of opinion given at this meeting leave me little to say. It appears to me to be the unanimous view of this meeting that prompt action is required in this matter. I say unanimous, because, although Mr. Henshaw appeared to dissent to some little extent, it was only in appearance, and I think that much that he said is the best argument possible for prompt and vigorous action. We should not look forward to the Government keeping us in suspense for three, four, or five years, but we should go to work ourselves and try to have our object obtained immediately. (Hear, hear.) By combining among ourselves, by understanding each other, by getting those who have the greatest interest in the community to come together determined to work heartily, by bringing every possible influence to bear on the Government, we must succeed. Every member who sees that his constituency is interested in having Montreal made a free port, should follow the example of my friend Mr. Desjardins, and act in whatever way is best calculated to further our interests. We all agree that the Harbor accommodation is far from being sufficient even for the present greatly increased traffic coming over the old lines. If that is the case now, what can be expected when the enormous increase of traffic, over the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other new lines in the northwest, comes to Montreal? Last year there was a surplus of twelve to fourteen million bushels of wheat alone in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. Judging from the additional

quantity of land broken up last autumn, we shall have nearly twice as much grain next year, if, as we hope, the harvest is favorable. Considering further, the opening of the roads leading to to the great milling centres of the northwestern States, the road from Minneapolis, the road from Duluth, and the road from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, with, no doubt, other lines to Sault Ste. Marie in good time, we in Montreal must be prepared to accommodate the enormous volume of freight which will come to us over these lines, the construction of which is of so much importance to the northwestern States and to Canada. Those interested in the lines already built to the Sault control an output of some 30,000 barrels of flour per day. Minneapolis gets to its mills more than 40,000,000 bushels of wheat in a year. If we consider this, and if we consider also the various products that are to be brought from the northwest, and the goods that will be required to be sent there in return, we may well feel that it is our duty to make every effort to bring as much of that trade as we can to the port of Montreal. That the trade will come from the northwest is certain, and we should not permit it to be diverted from the Harbor of Montreal. If we cannot all at once make Montreal a free port, we ought to aim at making it as near so as possible. (Applause.) Let us go to the Government with as strong a force as possible, with the members interested in the making of Montreal a free port supporting us, and I for one, cannot doubt that we shall have success. (Applause.)

Mr. J. J. CURRAN, Q.C., M.P., said :—After all that has been said, it would be unbecoming on my part to detain you for many minutes. I think there is a great deal in the remarks that have fallen from the Hon. Mr. Abbott, Mayor of the city. In the first place, we are unanimous here that the more strongly we urge this matter upon the Government, and the more positively we speak, the likelier we are to succeed. I should like very much that the gentlemen present, especially those who think that the city members and their associates from neighboring constituencies have not done all that could be done, to remember that we are only a small body among two hundred and fifteen members, a large number of whom entertain different views from those entertained by the entire meeting here; and that we have had to fight all along a vast amount of sectional jealousy, prejudice

and indifference, which has not been confined to one side or other of the House. Even last session, when the question of obtaining a loan was on the *tapis*, to complete the work of deepening the Channel, two prominent gentlemen—Mr. Jones of Halifax and Mr. Mills of Bothwell—on the other side of the House, made furious attacks on Montreal in regard to its pretensions in reference to the Channel. It appears clear to my mind that we have made considerable progress, although not so much as some people imagine, to get the Government to assume this Lake St. Peter debt. I firmly believe we have reached the point that next session we shall have that debt assumed. We may possibly achieve that. (Applause.) It was only by educating public opinion and the unceasing efforts made by our Board of Trade, Corn Exchange, and other similar bodies in this city, and through the favorable advocacy of the press, on both sides of politics, in different parts of the Dominion, whose utterances could be laid before the Government at any time, that this result could be brought about. Some reference has been made to the City of Montreal, through its Corporation, giving some aid in the matter of a free port, which I take to be quite a distinct question from that of the assumption of this Channel debt by the Government. (Hear, hear.) Most of those present will remember that at the excursion of the Corn Exchange down the river, last summer, Alderman Grenier, Chairman of the Finance Committee, was present, and met, to some extent, the reproach against the City Council. He said that if the Channel debt were assumed by the Government, the charge which now falls on shipping for the protection of the Harbor by a body of police, would be assumed by the city. That was reasonable, and would be a great relief to the shipping interest, because whilst the Dominion Government, through the Marine and Fisheries Department, paid that police force, there was a tax levied on the shipping of the port to meet the expense. (Applause.) I have always endeavored to carry out the views of our Board of Trade and Corn Exchange, believing that they represent the commercial and manufacturing interests of the city of Montreal, and I intend to follow the same line of action in the future. (Applause.)

In this great meeting to-day we have achieved something. I am satisfied that everyone here is willing to do his utmost

towards obtaining the object we have in view. Let us first work to have the Harbor Commission relieved of the River debt. At a future period, if we can go to the Government and show them two such powerful institutions as the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific railways, running through every constituency in the country, endorsing our application, the time may come, and come soon, when Montreal will be made a free port. At all events, I presume that the Committee named now will go to work at once, and prepare a plan to carry out our object. The Channel debt being assumed, and the prejudices which have existed heretofore overcome, we shall be enabled to go ahead and free our port from this taxation on shipping.

Let us bend all our energies for the present towards the one object of inducing the Government to assume the Lake St. Peter debt. A powerful leverage can be brought to bear through the combined action of members directly interested. Above all things, let us present the case in its true position not as a Montreal question, which will excite jealousies, but as one affecting the interests of the Dominion. Those who desire to paralyze our efforts seek to make it a local question; we must not play into their hands. I deem it but fair to say that we have always had the good will and concurrence of the members of the adjoining counties, and if we adopt a course calculated to awaken the people generally to the importance of the issue now before us, we may safely reckon upon the Government of the Dominion doing us justice. (Applause.)

Mr. DESJARDINS, M.P., Hochelaga, said:—I have not much to add, but I am glad to be present to answer the accusation brought against neighboring members of Parliament, that we are indifferent to the interests of the city of Montreal. That is not precisely the case. For one, I have often complained that the citizens, representing large interests of the city of Montreal, do not avail themselves more than they have of the services of members representing the outlying counties. The first news I often get of a deputation going to Ottawa to urge an important question on the Government, is when I see it in the papers the next morning. The fact is that, in my opinion, the citizens of Montreal have been too self-reliant; while they have seen the people of other centres of commerce looking to the Government for the public works required

in their own localities, the citizens of Montreal were depending on themselves alone. We may be proud of this, but we ought to take a leaf out of our neighbours' books when they are moving in the right direction. They have received large sums of money from the Government from year to year, while we have been paying our own way. I am very glad to see that the citizens of Montreal now believe that they ought to do the same as the people of Quebec. Why has the city of Quebec obtained \$5,000,000 for improving the Harbor, when there was no possibility of paying the interest? because the city of Quebec has been doing all along what we are thinking of doing now. You see now that not only in the vicinity of Montreal, but from Kingston down, you can bring forty representatives who will accompany you to the Government and obtain from them the assistance you are entitled to. By agitation as has been suggested, by interesting the newspapers and furnishing them with figures, and by influencing public opinion, you will succeed in making Montreal what it ought to be, the great port of the Dominion. Not only will Montreal but the entire Dominion benefit by the improvements in our port. Our canals are worthless unless you can bring to Montreal a large shipping business. I beg to say that I am at one with the object of this meeting, and that you can depend on my support in carrying it out. (Applause.)

Mr. SHANLY, M.P., said:—I have nothing to add to what has been already said. The important part of the business of the meeting has been reached. I will say this in reference to what my friend, Mr. Desjardins, has said about certain members between here and Kingston. I am neither a Montreal merchant nor a shipper. I am here as a representative of an Ontario constituency, and I believe that my constituents in Ontario are largely interested in the improvement of the port of Montreal. I repeat what Mr. Desjardins has said, that I am entirely one with the object of this meeting, and I will help your efforts in any way I can, either in Parliament or out of it. (Applause.)

Capt. LABELLE, M.P., said:—I agree with what has been stated at this meeting. As one of the members representing a constituency below Montreal, I will be in the lobby of the House to meet you gentlemen and to vote in favor of exempting Montreal from the Harbor debt and improving the Harbor of Montreal.

The CHAIRMAN:—Any other practical suggestions are in order now before we bring the meeting to a close.

Mr. MUNDERLOH :—I wish to state that the city of Antwerp paid one-half of the 100,000,000 francs, required to improve its Harbor, and the country of Belgium, which is a very small country, the other 50,000,000. I think the city of Montreal should surely do something.* Our position in the past reminds me of the story of the Irishman who fired at a bird, and the recoil of the gun knocked him down. When he got up again, he saw the bird chirping on a tree, and he said to him: "Ah! my boy, if you were at the other end of the gun, you would not chirp that way." (Laughter.) We have been firing blank cartridges hitherto, but I am glad to see now that we intend to look after our rights in the proper way.

Mr. HENSHAW :—I think we should not forget the extension of the Harbor, which was the object of this meeting.

Mr. R. A. SMITH said :—The object we have in view is the attraction of tonnage to the port of Montreal. If we are relieved of the Lake St. Peter debt, and the money thereby saved is appropriated to Harbor improvements, without relief being extended to shipping, I for one do not believe that the desired result will be attained. I think I fairly represent the views of the shipping interest generally when I say that there cannot be any very material increase in tonnage unless taxation is removed. It is essential that vessels should find Montreal a cheap port. If we are relieved from the Lake St. Peter debt and the taxes on tonnage are not reduced thereby, we shall, I am convinced, fail in the attainment of the great object we have in view. (Applause.)

Mr. HUGH McLENNAN :—I take it that the improvement of the Harbor and, as far as practical, the reduction of the expenses upon shipping, will be the objects of this Committee.

* With a view to secure accuracy on this point, Mr. Munderloh, after the meeting, telegraphed to Antwerp, and received in reply the following cable, which materially modifies the statement made above:—

"MUNDERLOH,

Montreal.

From Anvers, Jan. 24, 1888.

New harbor constructions cost sixty-eight million francs, whereof nine-tenths paid by Government, one-tenth by city.

STEINMAN."

Mr. WATT:—It should be put inversely, as in the Resolution; first, the removal of taxation on shipping, and then the improvement of the Harbor.

The CHAIRMAN again read the Resolution, which was unanimously adopted by the meeting.

On the motion of Mr. OGILVIE, Sir DONALD SMITH conveyed to Mr. DRUMMOND the cordial thanks of the meeting for the interest he took in the matter and for his conduct in presiding over the important conference.

The proceedings then terminated.

olution;
improve-

unani-

onveyed
for the
esiding

APPENDIX A.

MEMORANDUM

RELATING TO THE

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE

SUBMITTED TO

SIR HECTOR L. Langevin, K.C.M.G., C.B.

FEBRUARY 1888.

H

S

p

le

fr

ti

in

p

S

an

d

in

st

p

d

q

ca

p

to

be

m

w

w

sa

pa

tr

—

THE ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE.

HON. SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G., C.B.,
Minister of Public Works, etc.,
OTTAWA.

SIR,

It is no doubt within your recollection that for many years past the condition of the harbor of Montreal, and the burdens levied on the trade via the St. Lawrence River have been frequently brought before the Government.

In the year 1880 you yourself brought the matter to the attention of the Montreal Harbor Commission and the Board of Trade in a letter requesting information, and covering all essential points, such as the cost of transport tolls on the Erie and St. Lawrence Canals; the harbor dues in Montreal, New York, and other United States ports; the cost of pilotage, police, etc.

The Harbor Commissioners and Board of Trade furnished the desired information, apparently after careful enquiry, and our intention in the following memorandum, is to supplement the statements then made, and to bring down the information to the present date.*

In that year (1880) the Harbor Commissioners were so confident that the Government intended at once to deal with the question and assume the Channel Debt that they communicated the gratifying intelligence to the Board of Trade and the public.†

It is much to be regretted that no steps have yet been taken to remove these burdens, and as a necessary consequence the Harbor Commission has since been powerless to effect any improvement of consequence, or to do more than continue its routine work, the burdens on shipping remaining much the same as they were, or without material reduction.

We desire on behalf of the railways centering in Montreal to say that seeing no effort of any kind has been made to keep pace with the enormous railway development of late years, their traffic has suffered, and the managers have constantly had to

* See pages 64-5.

† See page 61.

deplore the absence of reasonable facilities for the conduct of their business in this port.

The shipping interests maintain that the burders in the shape of dues on ship and cargo, drive from this port much business which would otherwise come to the St. Lawrence, and the fact that these dues are very much greater than in United States ports, notably New York, is established by the actual disbursement accounts appended hereto. The facts presented in the appendix are so startling that the mere statement of them must, we think, demonstrate the urgent need of a prompt and sufficient measure of relief.

Seeing that vessels have the option of coming to this or going to United States ports, it seems perfectly plain that the trade of the port, and not the ships, must bear the burden of these dues. It is quite impossible that tonnage and other dues should affect the trade otherwise than in adding to the cost of imports, and leaving a smaller net return on all grain and produce exported.

The City of Montreal is beyond question interested, but not by any means to the extent it was under former systems of business. Formerly few articles were imported or exported without yielding some tribute to the city, now much of trade simply passes through, without being owned or controlled in Montreal at all.

This being so, the burdens we complain of are laid, not on the trade of the city alone, but directly also on the business of the West, and the question affects every portion of the Dominion, either importing or seeking the cheapest road to the sea-board, and a market for its produce via the St. Lawrence canals and river.

Other interests are concerned, such as the carrying business on the lakes and canals. These are not permitted to share the business with United States ports, and have been reduced to a very low ebb by the entire abolition of dues on the Erie Canal, so that our magnificent and costly canal system is not doing more than a fraction of the business it is capable of.

The question whether the construction of the ship channel from here eastward is a government duty and ought in fairness, and in accordance with the general policy in force as regards other localities, to be made a public charge, we do not desire to discuss at any length as you and the Government must be familiar with all that can be said on the question, we would however

adduce the example of the United States, the Federal Government there assuming all such duties, even the channels into the wealthy port of New York being made and maintained without any charge connected with the work being laid as dues on the commerce of that port. We desire, however, unanimously to record our opinion that the interest on the ship channel debt ought not fairly to be levied on the trade of this port, and that its effect has been to deprive the St. Lawrence route of a great deal of the business which might otherwise have been done over it.

We believe that a truly national policy is to free the St. Lawrence route entirely, so that the enormous expenditure on canals and railways may be utilized to the utmost in the development of Canadian trade.

It cannot be too clearly insisted on that, of late years, the manner of conducting trade has materially changed. When a ship is chartered to come here with an inward cargo, the outward cargo is a necessity, and is promptly looked after. The very fact of her coming here ensures that both her inward and her outward cargoes are diverted from some rival port in the United States, and carried to a market at figures which are in favor of the shipper of the goods.

It is not the case that any reduction of dues would benefit the shipping interest exclusively; the increased tonnage attracted to the port would inevitably entail cheaper freights, and transfer the benefit to the cargo. But it is manifest that the advantages of the National Policy, can only be fully attained by making our own ports cheaper (or as cheap) places to come to than any American rival. It is notorious that the capital invested in Canadian Ocean Steamship lines, has not, of recent years, yielded even interest.

The full advantages of the St. Lawrence route cannot be obtained till it is put at least on a par with New York, which implies that a bushel of grain can be sent from the Great Lakes to the Ocean, absolutely **FREE** from dues or charges of any kind, other than the cost of carriage.

Briefly, we urge that the channel is a Government work. That the position of the city of Montreal towards the trade of the St. Lawrence is materially changed of recent years, the interest in that trade being not so much local as Dominion. That the competition of United States ports is every year keener;—what

with free canals, competing railways, and ports dredged and lighted by the Federal Government. That our canal system is not employed, and our inland carrying trade nearly extinct, in consequence of our neglect of the advantages Nature has afforded us, and the disabilities we have imposed on what is the shortest route to the ocean. We have proved that the charges on commerce via the St. Lawrence are much more onerous than similar charges in United States ports.

The first step, in remedial measures, we conceive to be the immediate assumption of the cost of the ship channel by the Dominion Government, and that the total sum levied as interest on that expenditure, should be re-appropriated for the extension and improvement of the harbour.

In our opinion, the St. Lawrence Canals should ultimately be enlarged to the capacity of the Welland, so as to permit of the passage of lake craft with unbroken cargoes from all points in the West to meet the ocean carrier.

That the whole route from the Lakes to the Ocean should be, at the earliest possible date, *freed* from dues or tolls of any kind we firmly believe to be a wise and enlightened policy and in the interest of the whole Dominion.

We have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servants,

(Signed,) GEO. A. DRUMMOND,
Chairman.

J. J. C. ABBOTT, Mayor,
J. GRENIER, Chairman Finance Committee,
Representing the City.

W. C. VAN HORNE, Vice President C. P. R.
JOSEPH HICKSON, General Manager G. T. R.
Representing the Railways.

ANDREW ALLAN, Allan Line,
ALEXANDER MURRAY, Beaver Line,
Representing the Shipping Interest.

W. W. OGILVIE, Exporter,
C. P. HÉBERT, Importer,
Representing the Board of Trade.

JOS. M. DUFRESNE, President,
La Chambre de Commerce.

MONTREAL, FEBRUARY 25th, 1888.

GENERAL SUMMARY.

A COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of the wharfrage charges in the Ports of Montreal and New York respectively:—

REGULAR LINES.

IN MONTREAL—		<i>Per Annum.</i>
Allan Line, for six months, \$86,586 (See p. 43) ..		\$173,172.00
IN NEW YORK—		
Cunard Line (one pier)		22,500.00
Anchor Line (two piers)		21,000.00
White Star Line (two piers—one of which they sublet)		45,500.00
Inman Line	(unknown)	
(private arrangement with the Penn. R.R.)		

AN OCCASIONAL LINER.

IN MONTREAL—		<i>Per Voyage.</i>
The Canada Shipping Co.'s SS. LAKE SUPERIOR, Sept. 29, Oct. 6th, 1887; total charge in Montreal on ship and cargo, the Harbor Board providing wharf room only (See p. 46). \$		1010.99
IN NEW YORK—		
Same vessel, New York, Jan. 21st to 28th, 1888; total charge on ship and cargo for use of wharf, with shed, closed and lighted		240.00
Excess in Montreal on one voyage		\$ 770.99

The charge in Montreal is four times as great as in New York.

A TRANSIENT STEAMER.

IN MONTREAL—		
The SS. KATIE, at Montreal, with a cargo of sugar inwards, and outwards on ballast, paid to Harbor Board (See p. 52)		\$ 939.66
IN NEW YORK—		
The charge for the same cargo and accommodation would have been—say five days at \$13.58		67.90
Excess in Montreal		\$ 871.76

In the foregoing no account is taken of the other Port Charges complained of by Messrs Anderson, McKenzie & Co., this enquiry having been limited to wharfrage charges alone.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS ACCOMPANYING THIS COMMUNICATION.

1. An official map of the piers and docks of the Harbor of New York.
2. The annual report of the Department of Docks for 1886-87, City of New York.
3. Rules and regulations and rates of wharfage, Department of Docks, City of New York, 1888.
4. Annual report of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal for 1880.
5. Board of Trade report on "Harbor Dues and Transit Charges at Montreal and Atlantic Ports," 1880.
6. Communications from the various Montreal steamship agents with respect to the Montreal harbor charges on merchandise and tonnage. (Page 41.)
7. A comparative statement of the wharfage charges in the ports of Montreal and New York. (Page 39.)

APPENDIX B.

THE FOLLOWING COMMUNICATIONS HAVE BEEN SENT IN BY THE
STEAMSHIP AGENTS IN MONTREAL.

ALLAN LINE OF ROYAL MAIL STEAMSHIPS,
MONTREAL, February 10, 1888.

GEORGE A. DRUMMOND, Esq.,
Chairman of Conference, etc., etc.

DEAR SIR, 1-

Replying to your request that we should furnish
"the exact amount of wharfage tolls levied at this port on our
ships and their cargoes during the past season of navigation,"
together with a statement of the equivalent charges in the port
of New York, we beg to say that we can furnish a closely approxi-
mate estimate of these Montreal tolls, together with the other
charges applicable to our wharf accommodation, which will prob-
ably be sufficient for your purpose.

In regard to wharfage charges and pier rents in New York,
we will see that the information you seek is forthcoming. Mean-
while, observe that navigation there lasts the year round, and
ordinary steamers make twelve or thirteen trips in the year of
fifty-two weeks; whereas to this port six voyages is the maximum,

and five rather more than the average number possible during the St. Lawrence season. The aggregate amount of wharfage, tolls, etc., collected from our ships and their cargoes in Montreal, must, therefore, be at least doubled when making a comparison with similar annual charges in the port of New York.

In some Atlantic ports, notably New York, wharfage is levied only on the ship, the cargoes going free. In others, wharfage is charged only on the cargoes (or on certain portions thereof), the ship going free. But here these tolls are imposed on both ship and cargo, and on bunker-coals, barges, etc., as well.

The wharfage charges on the tonnage of the ship we can give exactly. On the 72 voyages of the over-sea steamers of the Allan Line during the navigation season of 1887, the aggregate of these tolls paid at the Custom House (on 172,637 tons net register) was \$12,345.69.

To reach the aggregate wharfage on cargoes, we have taken an average voyage of one London, one Liverpool, and one Glasgow steamer, the details of which you will find on the accompanying sheets, and the average of the three voyages is—

For the inward (imported) cargoes....	\$435.22	per voyage.
For the outward (exported) do	380.63	do do

The dismantling in the autumn, warehousing during winter, and re-erection in spring of our wharf sheds costs us \$8500, without reference to interest, tear and wear, or insurance; and the insufficiency of this shed accommodation involves us in a further annual expense of \$1000 for tarpaulins which we have not included here.

We also own four iron barges (measuring 1077 tons) for use as supplementary wharf room. These cost about \$4000 to maintain in commission for the season, and a further sum of \$3000 represents interest on capital and depreciation, making an annual outlay, with respect to this item, about \$7000.

Wharfdues are payable on the property handled upon the barges whether the wharves are used or not used. Also on the craft themselves, on which we formerly paid so much as \$230 per

barge per annum, but the Board has lately reduced the rate to \$75 each, or \$300 per annum for the four. We are also subject to an annual charge of about \$225 for the space occupied by our wharf huts.

Our ships do not coal in Montreal. Wharf-room here has always been scarce and wharfage dues high. For these and other reasons, we long ago found it necessary to acquire extension wharf property in Quebec, where we warehouse our stock of coals, but we have not estimated the expense of this, nor of our wintering establishment at Sorel, in the following statement of expenditure.

The case, therefore, stands thus :—

Wharfage dues on steamers.....	\$12,345.69
Do do on their cargoes, namely :—	
72 voyages inwards @ \$435.22.....	31,335.84
72 do outwards @ \$360.63.....	27,405.36
Add—	
Sheds, annual expense without rent.....	\$8500.00
Barges, annual cost of.....	7000.00
	15,500.00
Total for a season of six months.....	<u>\$86,586.89</u>

The wharfage taxation of the St Lawrence route, in so far as it is borne by the traffic carried by the steamers of the Allan Line trading with this port, is therefore represented by a sum exceeding one hundred and seventy thousand dollars a year.

At intervals throughout every season, and more particularly during some weeks in autumn, the limited wharf accommodation allotted to our steamships is taxed to the utmost of its capacity, and our work is done at very considerable extra cost to ourselves and inconvenience to our customers and the public. We do not, however, complain of this inconvenience nor calculate its cost to us at the present time. Much of it would be removed by remedial measures, especially by a more prompt handling of their goods by the consignees. In our opinion, the one measure of relief, presently essential, is the abatement of this excessive taxation.

We are,

Yours truly,

H. & A. ALLAN.

A MEMORANDUM of the Montreal wharfage charges levied by the Harbor Board on the cargoes of three steamships of the Allan Line during the season of navigation, 1887:—

POMERANIAN, London, September voyage.

INWARDS.				
Measur't	859	tons @	25c.....	\$214.75
Weight	342	" @	20c.....	68.40
	1140	" @	25c.....	285.00
				\$568.15
Outwards.				
Weight	1289	tons @	7½c.....	\$ 96.67
	799	" @	15c.....	119.85
	557	" @	25c.....	139.25
Deals				27.95
Cattle				24.52
				403.24

CARTHAGINIAN, Glasgow, October voyage.

INWARDS.				
Measur't	58	tons @	25c.....	\$ 14.50
	65	" @	15c.....	9.75
Weight	412	" @	25c.....	103.00
	859	" @	7½c.....	64.42
	448	" @	20c.....	89.60
	12½	" @	10c.....	1.25
	10	" @	15c.....	1.50
				284.02
OUTWARDS.				
Weight	1441	tons @	7½c.....	\$ 108.08
	794	" @	15c.....	119.10
	507	" @	25c.....	126.75
Measur't	23	" @	25c.....	5.75
Deals				12.88
Cattle				30.45
				403.01

SARDINIAN, Liverpool, October voyage.

INWARDS.			
Measur't	379	tons @ 25c.....	\$ 94.75
	84	" @ 20c.....	16.90
Weight	1229	" @ 25c.....	307.25
	106	" @ 20c.....	21.20
	134	" @ 10c.....	13.40
			453.50

OUTWARDS.

Weight	1165	tons @ 7½c.....	\$ 87.38	
	358	" @ 15c.....	53.70	
	570	" @ 25c.....	142.50	
Measur't	108	" @ 25c.....	26.50	
	Deals.....		20.55	
				330.63

Total..... \$ 2447.55

Inwards :—Average, \$435.22 ; total.....\$1305.67

Outwards :—Average, \$380.63 ; total..... 1141.88

2447.55

The Wharfages on our SS. PARISIAN are usually much greater than the foregoing. The following is the sum paid to the Harbor Commissioners on one voyage last season. Our other outlay for sheds, barges, light, etc., etc., will amount to about \$250 more.

INWARDS.

Weight	2221	tons @ 25c.....	\$ 555.25	
Measur't	581	" @ 25c.....	145.25	
Do.	47	" @ 15c.....	7.05	
				\$707.55

OUTWARDS.

Weight	1432	tons @ 25c.....	\$ 358.00	
Do	10	" @ 20c.....	2.00	
Do	270	" @ 15c.....	40.50	
Do	988	" @ 7½c.....	74.10	
Deals.....			3.95	
Cattle.....			1.15	
				479.70

SHIP:—

Ten days in port.....	344.50
-----------------------	--------

Total for one voyage..... \$1531.75

And for a year of 52 voyages of such vessel, equal to.... \$79,651.00

NOTE.—The wharfage ton is 2000 lbs. weight, and 40 cubic feet of measurement.

CANADA SHIPPING COMPANY.

BEAVER LINE OF STEAMSHIPS,

No. 1 Custom House Square,

MONTREAL, Feb'y 10, 1888.

TO GEORGE A. DRUMMOND, ESQ.,

President of the Conference, etc., etc.

DEAR SIR,

In answer to your request I have to say that the steamers of the Beaver Line having for some years been trading between Liverpool and New York during the winter months, I am able to furnish accurate and detailed information regarding the harbor charges of the two ports—Montreal and New York.

In Montreal Harbour the charges are three-fold :—

1. There is a charge of one-cent per ton per day, exacted during the whole time the steamer remains within the Harbor limits, whether occupying a berth, or waiting until a suitable berth becomes vacant.

2. There is a charge per head of livestock and per ton of cargo imported, whether discharged on to the wharf or transferred to craft alongside.

3. There is a charge on all export cargo and live stock loaded on the vessel, whether the wharves be used or not used.

And in addition to these direct charges we, in common with the other regular lines, have to erect and maintain our own sheds.

I have summed up this taxation on one voyage of our SS. LAKE SUPERIOR last season as follows :—

The vessel arrived 29th September, departed 6th October,	
7 days in Harbor, 2960 tons @ 1c. per day	\$207.20
On the cargo inwards—	
The wharfage dues were	549.30
On the cargo outwards—	
The wharfage dues were	254.49
Total Harbour tax for one voyage on ship and cargo...	<u><u>\$1010.99</u></u>

In New York there are three options open to a steamship agent:—

1st—His ship may have the use of one of the public piers, allotted by the Dock Master, the daily charge for which is fixed by statute at “two cents per ton for each of the first 200 tons burden, and one-half of one cent per ton for every additional ton.” We have not used these berths; they are without sheds and similar to the open public wharves in Montreal. See pamphlet—“Dock Regulations”—herewith;

Or, 2nd—The exclusive continuous use of a pier, with sheds, storehouses and other structures, may be leased at an annual rental either for a single year or for a term of years. This is the arrangement under which many of the regular ocean lines hold their piers. The rents vary from \$8,000 to \$15,000 for the smaller piers, up to from \$20,000 to \$30,000 for the large new piers in choice positions for the city traffic;

Or, 3rd—A pier or berth may be hired by the day for the ship's exclusive use during her stay in port. This is the arrangement we have heretofore made, and for this service we have paid sums varying from \$40 to \$50 per diem while the ship occupied the berth.

In New York there is no wharfage charge on cargo, livestock, or passengers; the foregoing payment, made by the vessel, covers and includes everything.

Our ships now use a pier on the East River, near Wall street; it is covered by a substantial shed, protected by gates and doors, and lighted for us at night. While in occupation we have the exclusive use of the entire pier, one side being used to berth the ship, the other side being available to load and unload her lighters or for other purposes.

Our LAKE SUPERIOR arrived there 21st January, and sailed thence 28th January, and the entire wharfage charge on ship and cargo, inwards and outwards, was:—

Six days wharfage at \$40 per day \$240.00.

The general result, therefore, is as follows :—

Wharfage on one voyage of ship and cargo in Montreal.	\$1010.99
Add an allowance for the use of shed and cost of Gas-light.....	150.00
Total in Montreal.....	\$ 1,160.99
Do. in New-York.....	240.00
Difference against Montreal for one voyage..	\$ 920.99
And for one year's business of 52 weekly voyages.	<u>\$47,891.48</u>

In New York the Federal authorities have provided elaborate and costly arrangements to receive foreign passengers from ocean steamers, and to transfer them to inland carriers, without delay or expense to the Ship.* No such facilities are provided in the harbour of Montreal.

Any further information you may require of us we will cheerfully furnish.

Yours truly,

H. E. MURRAY,
General Manager.

EXTRACTS FROM the pamphlet sent in by Mr. Murray, entitled : — City of New York : Board of the Department of Docks : Rules and Regulations and Rates of Wharfage. 1888.

§ 798. It shall be lawful to charge and receive within the city of New York, wharfage and dockage at the following rates, namely : From every vessel, that uses or makes fast to any pier, wharf or bulkhead within the said city, or makes fast to any vessel lying at such pier, wharf or bulkhead, or to any vessel lying outside such vessel for every day or part of a day, except as hereinafter provided, as follows : From every vessel of two

* Unless the United States customs duty (of six cents per ton per voyage, not exceeding thirty cents in any one year) levied on all foreign shipping entering any sea-port, be deemed an equivalent.

hundred tons burden and under, two cents per ton; and for every vessel over two hundred tons burden, two cents per ton for each of the first two hundred tons, and one-half of one cent per ton for every additional ton; and every vessel that shall leave a pier, wharf, bulkhead, slip or basin without first paying the wharfage or dockage dues thereon, ... shall be liable to pay double the rates due by this section.

§ 801. It shall be lawful for the owners or lessees of any pier, wharf or bulkhead within the City of New York, to charge and collect the sum of five cents per ton on all goods, merchandise and materials remaining on the pier, wharf or bulkhead owned or leased by him, for every day after the expiration of twenty-four hours from the time such goods, merchandise and materials shall have been left or deposited on such pier, wharf or bulkhead, and the same shall be a lien thereon.*

§ 802. " It shall be the duty of every person owning or having charge of any pier, wharf, bulkhead or slip in the City of New York, to cause to be printed on the back of all bills presented by them for wharfage, section seven hundred and ninety-eight of this act,"† and the owner, consignee or person in charge of any vessel shall not be required to pay the wharfage or dockage due on such vessel, unless upon his demand, the bill printed in conformity with this section is presented to him. Any person owning or having charge of any pier, wharf, bulkhead or slip as aforesaid, who shall receive for wharfage any rates in excess of those now authorized by law, shall forfeit to the party aggrieved treble the amount so charged, as damages, to be sued for and recovered by the party aggrieved.

* Twenty-four hours is also the time allowed by the by-laws of the Harbour Board of Montreal.

† So printed in the book of Regulations.

LETTER FROM MESSRS. ANDERSON, MCKENZIE & Co., AGENTS
OF THE FURNESS LINE, AND OF TRANSIENT STEAMSHIPS.

MONTREAL, February 13th, 1888.

GEO. A. DRUMMOND, Esq.

Board of Trade.

DEAR SIR,

You have asked us to inform you how those transient steamships, known as "tramps," are accommodated in Montreal when compared with other places, and in reply we have to give it as our opinion, that the facilities here are the poorest, and, as to cost, by far the dearest, of any port on this continent.

Transient tonnage of this character is very useful to a shipping community. The vessels can commonly shift ports on their water-ballast. When here, they are ready to carry a cargo for a Canadian exporter to any destination; and when abroad, they are ready to go to any port where a Canadian merchant may own a cargo, and bring it to Montreal.

In Boston and New York covered piers or wharf storehouses, into which cargo can be discharged, are freely open to transient vessels, but nothing of the sort is furnished here. Such ships have therefore to find wharf-dunnage, hire tarpaulins, and protect the property as best they can.

But it is in respect of its charges that this port transcends all others, in proof of which we give you details of the disbursements of the SS. KATIE during some voyages last season.

This vessel came to Montreal in the end of May in ballast seeking a cargo; she made two midsummer voyages carrying cargo both ways; and late in autumn she brought to Montreal a cargo of sugar and other merchandise, but, the season being about to close, had to leave hurriedly in ballast without cargo.

In the latter case, the inward cargo being perishable and the weather inclement, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for the work to have been got through had not the Messrs. Allans placed their sheds at our disposal for the protection of the sugar while in transit.

For purposes of comparison we have assumed the export cargo and the import cargo of the first and last voyages to be equal to

one round trip, inasmuch as the ship's earnings from ballast were nil; and we submit the following figures, which show the exactions of the Harbor Commissioners for wharf charges alone:—

Wharfage on the Import of sugar and other cargo	\$ 860.88
Do. on the Ship, 2116 tons, say 5 days, at 1c....	105.80
Do. on the Export cargo of produce	229.29
Total	<u>\$1195.97</u>

Being an average of \$239.20 for each of the five days.

In New York, an open berth, such as the Harbor Master has to offer us here, would have cost \$13.58 per day; and a berth at a pier provided with ample shed or warehouse accommodation \$30 or \$35, or at most \$40, per day, for a vessel of this tonnage and class.

Were it not for the better rates of freight generally obtainable here, and for the cheaper cost of labor and provisioning in Canada, these wharf charges would of themselves suffice to drive vessels from the St. Lawrence.

We append a detail of the Montreal port-charges, governmental and otherwise, that you may see how excessive they are. Our Pilotage dues are higher than in New York, Boston or Portland. Hospital and Police dues we have never heard of elsewhere in America. If we have to work at night, or if merchants are slow to bring in their permits or to take away their goods, the Government exacts from us payments for so-called "extra services" of Custom House officers. The Port Warden fees, which in other ports are optional and for services rendered, are here a legal tax on ships and export cargo. The Harbor currents are so strong and berthing so difficult, that tugs and boats have to be employed to assist in bringing the ship to her wharf. And when the cargo is taken from or brought to the ship by lighters, the same dues are exacted on the goods, and also on the lighters, as if wharves had been used in the usual way.

Altogether, we think it will be difficult to find a port in America where the charges are so excessive and the facilities so indifferent as in the Port of Montreal.

We are,

Your obedient servants,

ANDERSON, McKENZIE & Co.

A MEMORANDUM of certain Port Charges levied on three voyages of the SS. KATIE (2116 tons) in and out of Montreal during the season of 1887: — No. 1 being inwards on ballast and outwards with full cargo, No. 2 inwards with full cargo and outwards on ballast; and No. 3 inwards with partial cargo and outwards with full cargo. Time in port on the three voyages, seventeen days in all, Sundays included.

GOVERNMENTAL CHARGES.	No. 1.	No. 2.	No. 3.
1. Pilotage and Trinity dues§..... extra at Father Point on this voyage.	221.90	266.16 39.00	244.04
2. Hospital and Police dues* §	105.80		105.80
3. Wharfage on ship and cargo§	353.09	939.66	895.22
Tarpaulin hire.....			65.85
4. Port Warden dues†	8.25	4.25	11.25
5. Custom House Officers†.....		35.00	42.00
OTHER CHARGES.			
6. Shipping Master.....	1.50	2.00	2.50
7. Harbour Tugs, etc.....	22.00	22.00	22.00
	\$695.54	\$1308.07	\$1388.66

* Payable on the first, second and third voyages made by a steamship during the calendar year; subsequent voyages being free.

† Compulsory on export cargo; for services rendered on import cargo.

‡ Compulsory for services "after hours."

§ Compulsory always.

Unmarked. Optional but necessary.

ALLAN LINE OF ROYAL MAIL STEAMSHIPS,

MONTREAL, February 13, 1888.

GEORGE A. DRUMMOND, ESQ.,

Chairman of Conference, etc. etc.

DEAR SIR,

You have asked us for a detailed statement of the wharfage-tolls levied on European steamships and their cargoes at the various seaports of the Atlantic coast which are in competition with the St. Lawrence route.

As regards the railway ports—Boston, Philadelphia and Baltimore, and to which Portland may now be joined—the statement made by the Chairman of the Harbor Board in his Report for 1880, at page 28, that “Steamers are free at railway wharves” has become the universal rule. In all four ports there is now no wharfage-toll levied either on the ship or on her through cargo, and, in so far as these ports are in competition with the St. Lawrence, they are absolutely free ports. The same is true also of Halifax, where the Dominion Government has provided extensive wharf accommodation, which is freely offered to all sea-going shipping, free of charge.*

In New York, with its great water feeder the Erie Canal,† its four trunk lines of railway, and its vast trade—local, domestic and foreign—the conditions are somewhat more complicated, and to elucidate these we transmit a map of the entire harbor, with the wharves and piers shown on a scale large enough to be distinct.

On the west side of the North River all the water-front is owned in fee-simple by Ferry, Railway and Steamship companies. The North German Lloyd and the Hamburg lines own their extensive wharves at Hoboken, where the Thingvallia, the White

* We understand that the Government collects some trifling wharfage dues on such Halifax merchandise as may pass over this wharf, probably for the protection of the owners of the private wharves in that city.

† Last season the Erie Canal delivered in New York 46,000,000 bushels heavy grain, while the Canal deliveries in Montreal were but 8,000,000 bushels.

Cross, and the Wilson lines are also berthed ; while the Inman, the Red Star, and some other lines have accommodation a short distance to the south, at the piers of the Pennsylvania Railway in Jersey City.

On the Brooklyn tide of the East River the water-front is also owned in fee-simple by Berry, Steamship, Railway, Warehouse, and Dock companies. The East Indian, South American, West Indian and Mediterranean trades centre here, and the wharf and warehouses owners compete with each other, and with the pier lessees of New York, for steamship custom.

In the city proper the wharves are for the most part civic property, and are either:—

(A) leased for a term of years not exceeding ten ; three-fourths or more of the whole area it thus disposed of, yielding an annual rental of \$1,024,696 :—or

(B) rented from year to year ; these rents amount to \$87,530 :—
or

(C) left open for the use of transient tonnage ; the wharfage dues from these amount to \$147,810.

The accompanying Annual Report of the Department of Docks for 1886-87, gives details of all the rented piers, with the name of the lessee, the conditions of the lease, and the annual rental. Some extracts from this Report are given below (see page 56).

The enormous local traffic of the city in passengers and goods, coupled with the competition among the Railway and Ferry companies has given an extreme value to certain convenient water frontages, and the regular lines of European steamships have suffered somewhat in consequence.

We have not ourselves had as much experience of New York as of the other ports named above, but we are aware that the railway companies compete with private wharf owners and with each other for the patronage of Steamships, even to the extent of offering free wharfage.

One of our vessels, the SS. COREAN, was there in March, 1887. She was berthed by her consignees at Prentice's Stores, pier No. 1, Brooklyn, at a charge of \$50 per day, equal to \$350 for seven days ; while the wharfage dues, if in Montreal, would have amounted to \$1256.23, as by the following details :

INWARDS :—

Measur't	— 486 tons. @ 25c.....	\$121.50	
Weight	—1222 " @ 25c.....	305.50	
Do.	— 421 " @ 20c.....	84.20	
			<u>\$511.20</u>

OUTWARDS :—

Weight	—1882 tons. @ 25c.....	\$470.50	
Do.	— 689 " @ 15c.....	103.35	
Do.	— 13 " @ 7½c.....	1.20	
Measur't	— 119½ M @ 10c.....	11.92	
			<u>586.97</u>

SHIP :—

2258 tons., 7 days @ 1c.....	158.06	
Total for the voyage.....		<u>\$1256.23</u>

In the month of February, our SS. NESTORIAN, was also in and out of New York, with a partial cargo inwards and a full cargo outwards. The wharfage charges on this voyage at the Montreal tariff rates would have been as follows :—

On the inward cargo.....	\$377.55	
On the outward cargo.....	499.96	
On the ship—		
1748 tons, 7 days.....	\$122.36	
Bunker-Coal 500 tons	41.80	
		<u>164.16</u>
Total for the voyage		<u>\$1041.67</u>

Generally we may say that our experience agrees with Mr. Murray's statement to the effect that commodious and convenient wharf room for steamships of large size can be procured at covered piers and at warehouse piers for \$40 up to \$50 per diem.

We need scarcely add that in New York, daily wharfage on steamships is chargeable only for the time the vessel remains in occupation ; while at anchor awaiting a berth she is free. Or that the one payment made by the vessel includes cargo as well as ship ; indeed there is a statute, quoted below (see p. 49, § 802), which forbids a wharfinger from exacting dues on goods unless his wharf has been used as a warehouse.

We remain,

Yours faithfully,

H. & A. ALLAN.

NEW YORK PIER RENTS.

Annual rentals of certain piers in the City of New York, taken from Annual Report of the Department of Docks for 1886-87.

NORTH RIVER.

NORTH RIVER.	
THE ANCHOR LINE—	
Pier 20 and bulkhead.....	\$ 9,000
Pier 21 and bulkhead.....	12,000
THE MORGAN LINE—	
Pier 36	15,000
THE NATIONAL LINE—	
Pier 38	30,000
THE GUION LINE—	
Pier 39	30,000
THE CUNARD LINE—	
Pier 40 (with \$7500 add. for a water privilege)..	22,500
THE FRENCH LINE—	
Pier 42	30,250
THE WHITE STAR LINE—	
Pier 44 } and bulkheads.....	45,500
Pier 45 }	
(Sublets one pier to other lines.)	
MEDITERRANEAN LINES—	
Pier 54	20,000
PIM BROS. LINES—	
Pier 55	20,000
THE ARROW AND BRISTOL LINES—	
Pier 56	25,000

EAST RIVER.

RAILWAY COMPANIES—	
Pier 4, 5, 6	29,000
Pier 8	8,000
THE MALLORY LINE—	
Piers 20 et 21	17,000
THE CLYDE LINE, ETC.—	
Pier 25 and half the bulkhead.....	8,000
Pier 34	10,000
Piers 38 et 40.....	20,000

NEW JERSEY.

THE NORTH GERMAN LLOYD—	
THE HAMBURG LINE, and	
THE WILSON LINE—	
Are at Hoboken, on the west side of the East River.	
THE INMAN LINE—	
THE RED STAR LINE—	

And other lines are at the Pennsylvania RR. wharves at Jersey City.

NOTE.—The piers are generally about 600 feet long and afford ample accommodation for two large steamships, one on each side of the pier. The wharf sheds are the property of the lessees.

DOMINION STEAMSHIP COMPANY,

MONTREAL, February 24th, 1888.

GEO. A. DRUMMOND, ESQ.,

Chairman of Conference, etc.

DEAR SIR:

In response to your enquiry, we are now in a position to furnish a recent illustration of the relatively light wharfage taxation levied in the port of New York, as compared with similar charges in the port of Montreal.

The SS. QUEBEC, of our Bristol Line, arrived at New York on the 6th January last, and cleared fully laden only on the 16th January. She was thus delayed ten days in port, and the entire wharfage charges and Port-Warden's fees were as follows:

1 day at Pier 44, North River, at \$25.....	\$ 25 00
9 " " " " " " \$40.....	360 00
Port-Warden's Fees.....	11 00
Total in New York.....	<u>\$396 00</u>

The same vessel was here last June, and cleared for Avonmouth Dock, and we give you her wharfage charges at this port.

INWARD CARGO :—

Weight, 1630 tons at 25c.....	\$407 50
415 " " 20c.....	83 00
Measurement, 18 " " 25c..	4 50
	<u>\$495 00</u>

OUTWARD CARGO :—

Weight, 1248 tons at 7½c.....	\$ 93 60
4 " " 15c.....	0 60
34 " " 20c.....	6 80
772 " " 25c.....	193 00
Measurement, 16 " " 25c.....	4 00
Deals	9 90
Live Stock	21 82
	<u>329 72</u>

SHIP :—

Ten days in port.....	173 10
-----------------------	--------

PORT WARDEN'S FEES :—

On Ship.....	\$ 7 25
On Cargo.....	53 83
	<u>61 08</u>

Total in Montreal..... \$1058 90

* This is one of the piers mentioned as under lease to the White Star Line (vide page 56.)

It will thus be seen that while the charges at New York were only \$396.00; for the same steamer and in port for the same time at Montreal they amounted to \$1058.90 — almost three times greater, — a most convincing proof that the citizens of Montreal are not moving a moment too soon in the direction of insisting upon Federal authorities assuming the Lake St. Peter debt, and of making their port free.

We are, etc.,

DAVID TORRANCE & Co.

General Agents for
HANSA STEAMSHIP COMPANY
and
WHITE CROSS LINE.

(IMPERIAL GERMAN CONSULATE)
MONTREAL, 29th February, 1888.

GEO. A. DRUMMOND, Esq.,
Chairman of Conference, etc.,

DEAR SIR :

In compliance with your request, we now beg to hand you enclosed memorandum showing the wharfage charges and tonnage dues which were levied here by the Harbour Board on two of our steamers;—viz., on SS. GRASBROOK, of the White Cross Line, and SS. KEHRWIEDER, of the Hansa Steamship Company, arriving here in May and July last respectively.

You will observe that the amount of those wharf charges on the GRASBROOK is \$942.12, and on the KEHRWIEDER \$1102.92. This does not include Port-Warden fees, nor expenses for shed accommodation, nor tug charges, which together amount to at least \$200 for each steamer at this port.

We are not in a position to give you our experience in regard to United States ports, as all goods intended for Canada carried by our steamers are invariably landed at a Canadian port, and all home cargoes during the present winter season have also been shipped from Canada. Still we are aware that, in consequence of their much lower charges, United States ports handle a very large portion of ocean traffic, which would be diverted to Montreal if the port charges were as moderate here,—always provided that

our harbour facilities are such as to enable us to handle such additional traffic with the necessary despatch.

Reduction of charges and harbour improvements should go hand in hand,—both are essential.

Yours respectfully,

MUNDERLOH & Co.,

HANSA LINE, SS. KEHRWIEDER, JULY, 1887.

INWARDS :—			
Weight,	1007 tons at 25c.....	\$251 75	
	420 " " 10c.....	42 00	
Measurem't,	1620 " " 25c.....	405 00	
	122 " " 15c.....	18 30	
			\$717
OUTWARDS :—			
Weight,	2243 tons at 7½c.....	\$168 22	
	17 " " 10c.....	1 70	
	44 " " 15c.....	6 60	
	4 " " 20c.....	0 80	
Measurement,	14 " " 25c.....	3 50	
Feed,	26 "	6 50	
Hay,	39 "	7 80	
Cattle,	235 head at 5c.....	11 75	
Sheep,	1421 " " 1c.....	14 21	
			224 08
SHIP :—			
	Nine days in port.....	164 79	
	Total.....	\$1102 92	

WHITE CROSS LINE SS. GRASBROOK, MAY, 1887.

INWARDS :—			
Weight,	1896 tons at 25c.....	\$474 00	
Measurem't,	734 " " 25c.....	183 50	
	110 " " 15c.....	16 50	
			\$674 00
OUTWARDS :—			
Weight,	22 tons at 10c.....	\$ 2 20	
	15 " " 20c.....	3 00	
	1744 " " 7½c.....	130 80	
	35 " " 20c.....	7 00	
	20 " " 22c.....	5 00	
Measurement,	3 " " 25c.....	0 75	
Live Stock,	349 head at 5c.....	17 45	
			166 20
SHIP :—			
	Nine days in port.....	101 92	
	Total.....	\$942 12	

AGENCY OF THE

DONALDSON LINE OF STEAMSHIPS TO GLASGOW,
TEMPERLEY STEAMSHIP LINE TO LONDON,
THOMSON STEAMSHIP LINE TO LONDON AND NEWCASTLE.

23 and 25, St. Sacramento Street,
MONTREAL, February 24th, 1888.

GEORGE A. DRUMMOND, Esq.

Chairman of Conference, etc., etc.

DEAR SIR,

Having taken communication of the letters addressed you by Messrs. H. & A. Allan and Mr. H. E. Murray, with figures relating to the charges of this port on shipping, as compared with those of Boston, New York and Baltimore, we beg to say, that such information as we possess fully establishes the very serious relative disadvantage under which the trade of this port labours as compared with others,—a fact which British ship-owners are becoming increasingly alive to, as evidenced by their refusal to accept charters for Montreal, except at an appreciable advance over rates current to other much less expensive ports.

Yours respectfully,

ROBT. REFORD & Co.

APPENDIX C.

The statement relating to the Harbour Commissioners made on page 35 has reference to the following correspondence :—

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF TRADE,

MONTREAL, April 29, 1880.

ANDREW ROBERTSON, Esq.,

Chairman Harbour Board,

MONTREAL.

SIR :

By direction of the President and Council of this Board I have the honour to hand you herewith a copy of a resolution passed at the public meeting of the Board held yesterday, and to request, on behalf of the Council, that you will, at the earliest possible moment, summon a meeting of the Commissioners to decide as to what extent they are prepared to go in recommending to the Government *relief to the shipping interests of this port*.

The Council, while refraining from offering any suggestions after the universal expression of public opinion on the subject in question has so freely been given, would earnestly request an intimation of the course your Board intends to pursue, it being of the greatest importance that whatever action may be taken should be made known to the Trade at once.

I am, etc., etc.,

WM. J. PATTERSON,

Secretary.

RESOLVED, that the Council of the Board of Trade be instructed to continue its efforts for securing *the reduction, if not abolition, of*

tonnage dues in the harbour of Montreal, and for the assumption by Government of the whole charge connected with the ship-channel improvements between Montreal and Quebec,—and that the co-operation of the Senators and Representatives in Parliament, the Harbour Commissioners, the Corn Exchange and the Corporation of Montreal be specially asked for; and further, that memorials on the question be prepared, returns forwarded, and such other steps taken as well tend to secure prompt and effective action towards accomplishing the objects in view.

The reply of the Harbour Commissioners was as follows:—

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE,

MONTREAL, May 6, 1880.

SIR:

I am instructed by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to state in reply to your letter of the 29th ultimo, addressed to the Chairman, that the subject-matter of the resolution, of which a copy was enclosed, has been under the consideration of the Commissioners for a considerable time with the view of attaining precisely the same objects as those which are therein contemplated.

* * * * *

Since the commencement of the Session the Board have had repeated interviews with the Government on the subject, and they are now assured by the *Honourable the Minister of Public Works* that the Government will be prepared to submit to Parliament at its next session a scheme for the relief of the Trade by the St. Lawrence route, which will include the removal of the Lake and River debt now resting on the Harbour Trust. * * * * *

The Commissioners congratulate themselves on the results thus obtained, and when the proposed measure is carried into effect they will be enabled to reduce the Tonnage and Harbour dues accordingly.

I am, etc., etc.,

H. D. WHITNEY,
Secretary.

WM. J. PATTERSON, Esq.,
Board of Trade, MONTREAL.

In May of last year a delegation of citizens of Montreal, including representatives of various public bodies, viz., the Montreal City Corporation, the Montreal Board of Trade, the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, the Shipping Interest, and the Citizens' Committee waited on the Honorable the Minister of Public Works, to make representations respecting flood prevention and reduced transit taxes, from whose proceedings, the following paragraphs are extracted:—

13. That the ship channel from Montreal through Lake St. Peter is essentially a Dominion work, as much so as the St. Lawrence canals, benefiting not Montreal alone, but affecting the cost of all movements of goods from Ontario and westward to and from the ocean.

14. That in view of the settled policy of the Dominion and Provincial legislatures to aid, with grants of money, commercial companies which build and operate railways, there is no reason why monies advanced to construct this canal under water should be a burden on the trade passing through it.

15. That the benefit of the remission of interest prayed for should be adjusted in lessening the dues now exacted on ships and goods passing through the ship channel, and should in no sense be considered a concession to Montreal.

16. That the accommodation in the harbour of Montreal is now insufficient for the trade, but the fact that the dues now levied are admittedly heavier than the competing ports, such as New York, has stopped improvement, prevented all extension and adversely affected the entire trade of the St. Lawrence route.

17. That this subject has been brought again and again before the Government in recent years, and the justice of the claim that it should assume the channel debt admitted, but for one reason or another, no action had been taken, and it was strongly urged that the promises so often made should now be redeemed and a Government measure dealing with it introduced in the present session of Parliament.

In replying, the Minister (Hon. Sir Hector Langevin), promised careful consideration, and expressed a hope that the Government would not be long in taking up the matter and dealing with it.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of Wharfage charges on Vessels in Foreign Trade and on Staple Goods in various Atlantic Ports in 1880. (From the Annual Report of the Harbour Commissioners for 1880).

	BALTIMORE.*	BOSTON.	PHILADELPHIA.	NEW YORK.
Steamships in foreign Trade.....	Free at Railway wharves; about 1c. per ton per day at other wharves.	Free except when not receiving or discharging cargo.	1c. per ton per day.	2c. per ton per day on first 200 tons and 1 c. on each additional ton. Half rate when lying idle. Receiving or discharging at Elevators—free.
Sailing Vessels.....	About 1c. per ton per day.	do do	1 to 1c. do	
Coal, Ballast, Bricks.....	10c. per ton.*			
Iron, Steel and Iron Rails.....	15c. do			
Agricultural Implements, Machinery.....	20c. do			
Grain in bulk—per 100 bushels.....	25c. per 100 bushels.			
Oats, per 100 bushels.....	25c. do			
Flour, per barrel.....	3c. per barrel.			
Beef, Pork, Fish.....	5c. per ton.			
Dry Goods—per 2,000 pounds or 40 c. ft.....	1c. per box.			
Groceries not enumerated, in small boxes.....	3c. per barrel.			
Alies, Beer.....	3c. do			
Liquors.....	10c. per crate.			
Crockery, Earthenware, &c., in crates.....	5c. per box.			
Glassware and China in packages.....	1c. per package.			
Butter.....	5c. per bale.			
Cotton, Hemp.....	1c. per bag.			
Coffee, Dried Fruit.....	6c. per hoghead.			
Sugar.....	10c. per hoghead.			
Molasses.....				
		Grain loaded at Elevators, free. These rates subject to discount of 25 p. c. to 75 p. c. Iron, &c., 40c. per ton weight. Foot or 30c. per ton weight. Wharfage, say 1c. per cubic Nominal rates for general merchandise.	No wharfage on goods.	No wharfage on goods.

*Note.—Half rates on all goods if received from or delivered to lighters outside. Free at Railway wharves if goods are received or forwarded by rail. This note refers only to Baltimore.

THE MONTREAL TARIFF.

For purposes of comparison, the "Tariff of Rates and Dues to be levied in the Harbour of Montreal, under and by virtue of the Acts 40 Vic., Cap. 53, and 42 Vic., Cap. 28, on and after the First day of April, 1881," is appended.

Tonnage Dues

To be levied on all Vessels in the Harbour.

On Steamboats, for each day of twenty-four hours, or part of a day, they remain in the Harbour, reckoned from the hour of their arrival to that of their departure... 1c. per Ton Register.
On all other vessels, per day, as aforesaid..... ½c. " " "

Wharfage Dues

To be levied on all Merchandise, Animals and Things whatsoever Landed or shipped in the Harbour.

25c. per Ton—All Goods, Wares and Merchandise not elsewhere specified.
20c. " " —Hay, Straw, Pig and Scrap Iron, Pot and Pearl Ashes.
15c. " " —Apples, Crates and their contents, Flour and Meals, Fish, Meats, Pitch, Potatoes, Tar, Horses, Neat Cattle, Sheep, Swine.
10c. " " —Ballast, Clay, Fire-Bricks, Gypsum, Lime, Marble, Phosphates, Sand, Salt.
7½c. " " —Coal and Coke, Grain and Seeds of all kinds.
Special..... Bricks, 10c. per 1,000; Cordwood, 5c. per cord; Lumber, 10c. per 1,000 feet, board measure.
Free..... Bullion, Specie.

On all Goods, Wares and Merchandise whatsoever, the quantity of which by weight, measurement or other mode of estimate provided for in this Tariff, cannot be conveniently ascertained, it shall be lawful for the Harbour Commissioners to levy a rate of $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent. on the value thereof.

Each entry shall pay not less than 5 cents.

All property landed on the wharves for re-shipment, shall only pay one wharfage.

The Ton mentioned in the Tariff of Wharfage dues shall be 2,000 lbs. weight, or 40 cubic feet measurement, according to the Bill of Lading.

STANDARD FOR ESTIMATING WEIGHTS.

Ashes, Pot or Pearl..... 3 brls. to one Ton.	Horses 2 to one Ton.
Apples, Flour, Meal, Potatoes 9 " "	Neat Cattle.... 3 " "
Fish, Meats, Pitch, Tar.... 7 " "	Sheep..... 15 " "
	Swine 10 " "

Certified,

H. D. WHITNEY,

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OFFICE,
MONTREAL, 26th March, 1881. }

Secretary.

PRIVY COUNCIL, C

OTTA, 1881.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Tariff has been approved by His Excellency the Governor-General in Council on this 1st day of April, 1881.

CITY COUNCIL OF MONTREAL.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED MARCH 20TH, 1888.

Whereas the trade of the St. Lawrence has heretofore been and continues to be seriously interfered with by excessive tolls and charges which are not levied on traffic by competing routes; and

Whereas, the opportunity of securing increased trade from the newly-opened territory in the Northwest and that reached via the Sault Ste. Marie now presents itself; and

Whereas, it is alike the duty and the policy of the Dominion Parliament to foster and encourage all enterprises tending to the development of the country, and especially to put the carrying-trade of the Dominion on at least as good a footing as via competing routes in the United States, and

Whereas, Parliament has now and in the past recognized this duty in various ways and more especially by freely voting grants of public money, as well to railways and canals, as to harbours, rivers and water-ways generally throughout the Dominion—practically as free gifts to commerce;

Therefore, be it resolved, That the Mayor, by petition or otherwise on behalf of the city, be respectfully requested to urge upon Parliament the important duty which now developes upon it, in the interests of the Dominion, to free the trade of the St. Lawrence from the exceptionnal burdens now resting upon it with respect to the deep-water channel between Quebec and Montreal, and its expenditure in carrying that burden for several years; and further to adopt such legislation as will secure to the St. Lawrence route and its most important harbour a fair opportunity of competing with the Erie and other United States routes and ports for a share of the traffic between the west and Europe.

The Shipping Interest of Montreal, at a recent meeting, passed the following resolution and communicated the same to their chairman and representative at the Harbour Board for communication to the latter body.

RESOLVED:—That improved harbour facilities are required and will be a valuable aid to the shipping trade of the port, nevertheless the one essential condition to be at all times urged is a prompt and substantial reduction in harbour taxation coupled with a continuous effort towards making Montreal a free port.

THE MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

SPEECH BY THE HON. SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, May 8th, 1888.

(*From Hansard.*)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide;—

(a.) That the Government of the Dominion of Canada may release and discharge the Corporation of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal from all liability to repay to the said Government the whole or any part of the advances made to the said Corporation to enable them to widen and deepen the channel in Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence from Montreal to Quebec, or any interest thereon beyond the amount of interest already paid by them to the Government (it being understood that no portion of the amount heretofore paid for interest is to be refunded);

(b.) That the Government may pay to the said Corporation of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal a sum not exceeding the sum of \$37,405 which they represent as being the excess of their expenditure (apart from the expenditure on capital account) over their net revenue during the calendar year 1887;

(c.) That the Government may, in addition to the said payment last mentioned, expend, through the medium of the said Corporation or other-

wise, in the work of completing the said channel, the amount now remaining unexpended of the sums authorized by any Acts heretofore passed to be advanced to the said Harbour Commissioners of Montreal for the purpose of completing the said channel ;

(d.) That no tonnage dues shall be hereafter levied on, or collected from, any sailing vessel or steamer at the port of Montreal ;

(e.) That the dredging plant and appliances heretofore used by the said Harbour Commissioners, in connection with the said channel works, shall hereafter belong to the Government of Canada.

He said :—In rising to move the resolution to provide for the assumption by the Government of what is familiarly known as the Lake St. Peter debt, I will detain the House but a short time, as this question has been so frequently before the House, that it is familiar to hon. gentlemen on both sides. The River St. Lawrence, a few years ago, would admit vessels drawing only nine feet of water to the harbour of Montreal. It was then determined to endeavor to deepen Lake St. Peter and remove obstructions, so as to improve the navigation of the river, and, from time to time, money has been appropriated by this House for that purpose and advanced to the Harbour Commissioners, who recouped themselves for the interest by tolls or tonnage dues levied upon ships and by wharfage dues on goods. The efforts that have been made, I need not tell the House, have been successful, and the entire amount appropriated for that purpose by the Parliament of Canada has reached the sum of \$3,005,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he proposes to abolish the wharf dues ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I have not come to that part of the subject at all. I said that, the Harbour Commissioners had recouped themselves for the interest payable on the money advanced by the Parliament of Canada to deepen Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence, by tonnage dues on vessels and by wharfage dues. The Commission have been discharging, I need not tell the House, two duties—as Harbour Commissioners and as Commissioners for the deepening of Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence. I say that the amount of money, altogether, authorized by the Parliament of Canada for the latter purpose has been \$3,005,000, of which there remains unexpended \$279,475. It

is estimated,—and I may here say that I believe no public body in this country have ever discharged a duty imposed upon them with greater ability or greater success than the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, and I believe they have been singularly fortunate in being able to command the services of so eminent and able an engineer as Mr. Kennedy, under whom these important works have been carried out—that with an amount of only \$20,000 over and above the estimate and appropriation of Parliament, the entire work of deepening the St. Lawrence so as to allow the passage of vessels drawing $27\frac{1}{2}$ feet of water will be completed. To widen the channel which has been thus constructed, so as to furnish the most complete facilities for navigation, it is estimated that \$195,000, or, in round numbers, some \$200,000 more will be required so as to perfectly complete the work. Now, the Government feel that the time has come when the question of that liability should be fairly considered. They feel that the time has come when it is in the interest of the whole of this country that this great water-way should be made free so far as tonnage dues on vessels are concerned, whether inland or ocean; they feel that the time has come when the great port of Montreal, the great commercial centre of the country, should be made practically a free port, so far as tonnage dues upon ocean or inland vessels are concerned, and the Government have arrived at the conclusion that if there is one public work in this country that may fairly be assumed by the Government and Parliament as chargeable upon the public revenue, it is the deepening of Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence, thus furnishing a means of bringing ships drawing $27\frac{1}{2}$ feet of water up to the city of Montreal. They believe it is not a question of the city of Montreal alone. They believe it is a question in which the whole tonnage of this country is more or less interested. They believe it is a question of importance to the whole trade of Montreal and to the whole trade of the country lying to the west of it, which will be greatly facilitated by taking this course. They believe it is a question that intimately touches this great water-way which lies between the Strait of Belle Isle and Port Arthur, giving facilities for the expansion of the trade and commerce of this country. They believe it is in the interests of the Dominion that this port, in the great commercial centre of the country, should be placed in such a posi-

tion as to be able to compete with the Atlantic ports in the neighboring Republic where there is great and sharp competition in ocean-borne traffic and in inland traffic from the great lakes down to the ocean. Under these circumstances, it is not necessary that I should detain the House, familiar as it is with the circumstances, at any length, in showing that it is desirable that this great public work should be assumed by the Parliament of Canada as a public work, in view of the objects to be attained. Therefore, we propose that the advances which have been made should be made a charge on the consolidated debt of this country, but we couple with the proposal to assume this indebtedness, the entire removal of all tonnage dues, so that Montreal shall be made in that respect a free port. We ask by these resolutions that Parliament shall assume all the advances that have been made to the Harbour Commission for deepening Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence. We ask that Parliament should agree to cover the amount of interest, which has been punctually paid by the Harbour Commissioners out of the revenues collected from the shipping at the port of Montreal. We ask that the deficit of \$37,000 which occurred in consequence of their having to pay the last instalment of interest, should be assumed by us so as to take that altogether off the harbour proper of Montreal.

Mr. CHARLTON. What will be the entire amount assumed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The amount appropriated is \$3,005,000. In addition to that there is the amount of \$220,000 for widening the channel which has been deepened; and \$37,000 of interest, which is a deficit caused by the last payment of interest. In that way the Harbour Commissioners are relieved from any obligation or burden imposed upon them in that way.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the Government undertake the responsibility of going on with improvements?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under the resolutions the work can be completed by the Harbour Commissioners themselves, or directly by the Government under the management of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MITCHELL. But, if you take away their revenues, they will have no money to go on with.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have provided the money to carry the work to its entire completion, and all we propose to take away from them is the tonnage dues.

Mr. WELDON (St. John.) What about maintenance?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been an expense of \$600,000 for new plant which becomes the property of the Government, and will cover the \$220,000 additional to what Parliament has already appropriated.

Mr. MITCHELL. But who is to improve the harbor and the wharves and matters of that kind?

[Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will remain with the Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where will they get the money?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Harbour of Montreal has never been chargeable to the extent of a dollar on the revenues of the country. The interest on the money we have advanced has been obtained from the tonnage dues on vessels and the wharf dues on goods. We do not propose to touch the wharf dues, which will not only leave in the hands of the commissioners the money required to maintain the harbour, but will give them a considerable margin to improve the Harbour of Montreal or to make a large reduction in the wharf dues. Do I make myself understood?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, the hon. gentleman makes himself understood, but I would like to know if the tonnage dues are abolished and there are still to be wharf dues, how it can be called a free port; but, if all are abolished, the commissioners will not be in a position to go on with the improvements?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend looks at their report, he will find that the commissioners will not be in the least degree embarrassed in relation to that matter. He will see that the expenditure of the Harbour Commissioners for the calendar year 1887, apart from the amount chargeable to capital account, was \$327,090, and that their net revenue was \$289,885. If you relieve them, as you do, they only had a deficit of \$37,000, and that was only caused by their paying nearly \$100,000 of interest. Conse-

quently, being relieved from any charge for interest, they have a large revenue left, which will enable them, from the charges of wharfage on goods at the port, either to make a large reduction in the wharfage dues, or to carry on the improvements in the harbour. The effect of making this a free port, as far as the tonnage dues are concerned, will make Montreal more attractive, and will enable the St. Lawrence, as a great route of intercommunication, to compete much more successfully with other ports and in that way will greatly increase the revenues of the harbour. Now, Sir, I do not intend to take up the time of the House longer, as at this stage of the Session I know how impatient the House is to proceed with public business. As this subject is so familiar to the House, I do not think it necessary to say more upon it than to make the brief statement I have to the House.

The resolutions were carried, and a bill founded on them was subsequently introduced by Sir Charles, passed by Parliament, and sanctioned by His Excellency, on Tuesday, May 22nd, 1888.

NOTE ON SIR CHARLES TUPPER'S SPEECH BY THE SECRETARY TO
THE COMMITTEE.

Sir Charles Tupper is absolutely correct in saying (p. 71), that "the Harbour of Montreal has never been chargeable to the "extent of a dollar on the revenues of the country." On the contrary, the Government, while making grants of money to harbours all over the Dominion, has foisted on the Harbour of Montreal expenditures which did not belong to it. To show these conditions more clearly, I have prepared a condensed analysis of the Board's published accounts, for the years 1881-87, from which the receipts and payments belonging to capital have been eliminated, leaving those only that properly pertain to income.

The Government has thought fit to offset the tonnage dues on craft against the interest-charge on the channel debt. Leaving out these items, the absolute solvency of the harbour proper is demonstrated from the following aggregates of its ordinary receipts and expenditures during these seven years, which were as follows :—

INCOME FROM

Imports.....	\$746,887	
Exports	405,532	
Local traffic	288,006	
Total.....		\$1,440,425

EXPENDITURE FOR

Management	\$236,453	
Repairs, etc.....	346,762	
Interest on Harbour debt.....	809,447	1,392,662
Leaving a surplus of.....		<u>\$47,763</u>

But Sir Charles is in error, in stating that the Harbour Commissioners had "recouped themselves for the interest "[on the Channel Debt] by tolls or tonnage dues levied upon "ships, and by wharfage dues on goods." So far from such being the case, the Commissioners have had for the past seven years or longer, an average annual deficit almost as large as that for the year 1887, for which Sir Charles makes provision by his second resolution (*vide c. p. 67*). The payments to the Government during these seven years, as for interest on the money supplied by them to carry on the Channel works, aggregate \$538,219; and the deficits during those years aggregate \$226,471, which latter sum has gone to swell the Harbour's indebtedness to money-

lenders, other than the Dominion Government. This increase in the harbour debt is not the only resultant evil. During the years that these deficits occurred, harbour extension and improvement were alike impossible, and these if undertaken now on borrowed money, involving a larger interest-charge and increased taxation to meet the same, would involve the Board in as great difficulties as before. The petition of the Committee (p. 38) "that the total sum levied as interest on that expenditure should be re-appropriated for the extension and improvement of the harbour," is as exigent now as it was a year ago when made.

The moneys exacted by the Government, as for interest on channel expenditure, are detailed in the following—

STATEMENT

Giving date and amounts paid to Dominion Government for Interest *in re* 27½ feet Channel.

1876	February 12th.....	\$38,572 27	
	October 4th	17,099 45	55,671 72
1877	December 15th.....		39,754 79
1878	July 25th.....		46,945 05
1879	July 10th.....		54,532 72
1880	June 30th.....		53,902 74
1881	August 8th		52,240 00
1882	June 16th	9,446 13	
	July 11th.....	61,275 72	70,721 85
1883	September 24th.....		68,407 67
1884	July 16th		74,575 34
1885	October 17th.....		81,704 10
1886	August 26th.....		91,384 75
1887	September 16th.....		99,187 22
Total for twelve years.....		\$794,027 95	

There are two other items of indebtedness by the Dominion Government to the Harbour Board which should not be lost sight of.

At the taking over of the twenty-feet channel in 1865, the expenditure by the Harbour Board was found to exceed the amount, for which the Government had procured an appropriation from Parliament by the sum of \$295,471. This amount has not yet been recouped to the Board by the Government.*

* "The appropriations, however, proved insufficient, and, besides the loss of interest and payments out of surplus revenue previous to 1860, the Harbour of Montreal has contributed a sum now exceeding \$300,000 to these works, beyond the payments assumed by Government." *Vide* "General Report of Dominion Public Works" p. 459.

There is also the Buoy Service between Montreal and Quebec, which was given over to the Harbour Commissioners while the Channel works were in progress, the Engineers in charge of the works being of necessity well-informed in that regard, and the plant necessary to the service being in the possession of the Commissioners. The actual cost of that service up to the end of 1887 was \$103,472.35, while the sums appropriated by Parliament amounted to only \$42,000.00, leaving a balance due by the Marine Department of the Government to the Harbour Board of \$61,472.35.

The Harbour Debt amounts to about two million dollars, chiefly in the form of debentures held by the public, the average annual interest upon which would seem to be nearly six per cent.

The amount by which this debt has been enhanced, in consequence of the foregoing exactions from Harbour revenues for Dominion purposes, as at 31st December, 1887, without reckoning interest, stood as follows:—

Balance of Expenditure by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal on the 20 feet Channel, over and above the amount assumed by the Dominion Government.	\$295,471 10
Balance of Expenditure by the same on Buoys and Beacons in the Ship Channel, since 1873, over and above the amount allowed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries	61,472 35
Total payments, as for interest on Channel expenditure, as above	794,027 95
	\$1,150,971 40
Less the amount provided, as representing the deficit for the year 1887.....	37,405 00
Balance due the Harbour revenues by the Dominion Government.....	<u>\$1,113,566 40</u>

This sum, if properly applied, would have reduced the debt burdening the harbour to about a million dollars, and, if Government had treated Montreal as they have treated Quebec and loaned the money at four per cent., the interest-charge paid by the public on the harbour traffic would have been only about \$40,000 per annum, whereas, it is nearly three times as much.

D. A. WATT.

A MEMORANDUM showing, approximately, the ordinary income and expenditure of the Harbour Board during the seven years 1881-87, condensed from the published Annual Reports of the Board.

INCOME FROM	1887	1886	1885	1884	1883	1882	1881	TOTALS.
Imports.....	\$ 126,264	\$ 109,070	\$ 90,704	\$ 94,900	\$ 108,245	\$ 118,438	\$ 99,266	\$ 746,887
Exports.....	72,907	72,171	53,171	52,080	56,381	46,821	52,001	405,832
Tonnage.....	52,966	49,002	42,245	46,281	42,793	40,329	45,217	318,733
Local Traffic.....	42,850	43,432	38,768	37,374	40,383	43,543	41,656	288,006
Dom. Government for Buoy.	7,000	14,000		7,000	7,000	7,000		42,000
Totals.....	\$ 301,887	\$ 287,675	\$ 224,888	\$ 237,635	\$ 254,802		\$ 238,140	
Annual deficits.....	37,527	24,618	60,953	38,594	14,730		25,385	
Total deficit during these seven years.....	\$ 339,414	\$ 312,293	\$ 285,841	\$ 276,229	\$ 269,532	\$ 256,131	\$ 263,525	226,471
								\$ 2,027,629
EXPENDITURE.	1887	1886	1885	1884	1883	1882	1881	TOTALS.
For Management.....	\$ 32,642	\$ 34,705	\$ 35,587	\$ 32,240	\$ 35,423	\$ 31,863	\$ 32,993	\$ 236,453
“ Repairs.....	71,119	60,101	42,200	46,374	44,796	28,579	53,593	346,762
“ Harbour Interest, etc.....	121,136	118,477	115,975	114,842	114,342	110,307	114,468	809,447
“ Lake St. Peter Interest..	99,187	91,385	81,704	74,575	68,407	70,721	52,240	538,219
“ Buoy.....	14,330	7,625	10,375	8,198	6,564	6,132	10,231	63,455
“ Suspense.....								33,293
Surplus.....						\$ 247,502		
	\$ 339,414	\$ 312,293	\$ 285,841	\$ 276,229	\$ 269,532	\$ 256,131	\$ 263,525	\$ 2,027,629

